Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases
Volume 20 · Issue 1 · e151834

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Factors Affecting Return to Work After COVID-19 Hospitalization in an Iranian Population

Mohammad Hossein Davari, Amir Houshang Mehrparvar, Ziba Loukzadeh, Mojgan Piri Ardakani, Amir Neshati, Farimah Shamsi, Abbas Jafari, Simin Manoochehry

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
4 Aug 2024	27 Nov 2024	12 Dec 2024	10.5812/archcid-151834

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1 2
2 **Revision 1** 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

1 comment · 15 Oct 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 15 Oct 2024

Dear authors,

I want to express my gratitude for the time and effort you dedicated to preparing the manuscript on "Factors Affecting the Return to Work after COVID-19 Hospitalization in an Iranian Population." I found the topic to be both novel and interesting, and I believe it falls well within the scope of the journal. However, I have a few comments that I believe will contribute to improving the manuscript:

1. It is necessary to provide more details of the methodology in the abstract.
2. Please include the statistics (both descriptive and inferential) in the results section of the abstract.
3. You should also specify whether you collected the data using a sampling or census method. If you used sampling, please clarify how you estimated the sample size and specify the sampling method. If not, please mention that the data were collected based on the census method.
4. The language in your manuscript needs improvement.

Best regards

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:

Dear authors,

I want to express my gratitude for the time and effort you dedicated to preparing the manuscript on "Factors Affecting the Return to Work after COVID-19 Hospitalization in an Iranian Population." I found the topic to be both novel and interesting, and I believe it falls well within the scope of the journal. However, I have a few comments that I believe will contribute to improving the manuscript:

Question:1. It is necessary to provide more details of the methodology in the abstract.

Reply: Thanks for reviewing our manuscript. Some details such as sampling method, data collection and statistics were added according to your comment.

2. Please include the statistics (both descriptive and inferential) in the results section of the abstract.

Reply*: It was added*

3. You should also specify whether you collected the data using a sampling or census method. If you used sampling, please clarify how you estimated the sample size and the sampling method. If not, please mention that the data were collected based on the census method.

Reply*: It was added. We used census method and all patient were asked about inclusion criteria.*

4. Your manuscript needs improvement in terms of language aspects.

Reply*: it was edited by an editor expert in academic writing.*

Reviewer 2:

Question: dear author

Thank you for sending the article, it should be noted that your article can only be accepted in this journal if the format is changed to "brief report".

Therefore, please rewrite and send the article in brief report format

Reply: Reviewer 1 asked us to add more explanations to the abstract and methods which is in contrast to the second reviewers comment.

---

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.