OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.109268
Published in: Health Scope: 10(1); e109268

Peer Review Report for "Impact of Comorbidities on Clinical Outcome of Patients with COVID-19: Evidence from a Single-center in Bangladesh"

Author(s): Md Jahidul Hasan, Ahmad Mursel Anam, Shihan Mahmud Redwanul Huq, Raihan Rabbani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Sep 2020
Revised Date: 22 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 5 Feb 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) 28 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs minor revision as follows:
Abstract
- Study time and statistical analysis should be added to the Abstract.

Methods
- It is suggested that the Sample inclusion and exclusion criteria and Definitions be merged.

Results
- Table 2 is long. It is better to summarize and bring only important information.
- It seems that the first line of the third paragraph (“In this study, 26.7% (N = 157)”) needs to be corrected.
- It seems that the ninth line of the last paragraph (“4 comorbidities: 4.7”) needs to be corrected.

Conclusion
- What are the practical recommendations for health policymakers and decision-makers

regarding the results of this study?
Best Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
- In the inclusion criteria stated that the Case should have moderate to critical symptoms of COVID 19, while the exclusion criteria stated that SPO2 was less than 85%. We know that SPO2 of less than 85% is one of the criteria for critical symptoms of COVID 19. Why did you exclude that?
- A few minor comments are written in the Manuscript.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 14 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
1- All exclusion criteria could be considered as inclusion criteria. For example “patients without current pregnancy” could be considered in inclusion criteria
2- Please mention to the SD along with the all means
3- Please refer to the numbers with the all percentages
4- In table 1, it is unknown what the p values are about and which groups are compared with respect to these variables.. The name of the statistical test should be mentioned.
5- Table 2 should be deleted. This is discrepant with the principal of summarizing of the data
6- The authors should render only one P value for figure 3
7- In table 3 ,the row percentages should be presented. Also, the authors should present only one p value for this table. Besides it is unknown which test was used to analyze the data for this table.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 17 Oct 2020

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “Major revision”.
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reply to reviewers' comments

Reviewer 01

1. All exclusion criteria could be considered as inclusion criteria. For example "patients without current pregnancy" could be considered in inclusion criteria

Reply:

Sample inclusion and exclusion criteria were reconsidered and modified without changing the previous submitted parameters.

2. Please mention to the SD along with the all means

Reply:

All the parameters were mentioned in median with IQR value in the tables.

3. Please mention to the numbers along with the all percentages.

Reply:

In everywhere, when percentage was used then the number (n) was used, simultaneously in the table and text.

4. In table 1 it is unknown that what the p values are about and which groups have been compared regarding these variables. The name of the statistical test should be mentioned

Reply:

The p value was determined by using one-sample t-test and the name of the test has been mentioned in the methodology with few modification of the sentence.

5. Table 2 should be deleted. This is discrepant with the principal of summarizing of the data

Reply:

Table 2 is representing the patient-wise comorbidity the severity of the disease which is difficult to represent without a detail-table. So, we think that this table can be considered in this manuscript for clear description of the study samples and better understanding.

6. The authors should render only one P value for figure 3

Reply:

We analyzed each category in respect of the number of comorbidities, individually. So, individual p value was obtained and mentioned in table 3. A single p value can be showed while all the categories are compared each other. But this type of analysis was not used here.

7. In table 3 the row percentages should be presented. Also the authors should pre4sent only one p value for this table. Beside it is unknown that which test was used to analyzing the data for this table

Reply:

We analyzed each category individually considering the different number of comorbidities, so all the categories have individual p value.

Reviewer 02

1. In the inclusion criteria stated that the Case should have moderate to critical symptoms of COVID 19, while in the exclusion criteria stated that SPO2 was less than 85%. We know that SPO2 less than 85% is one of criteria for critical symptoms of COVID 19. Why you excluded that?

Reply:

We mistakenly included this criterion of exclusion. Finally, we rejected that and modified the inclusion and exclusion criteria.

2. A few minor comments are written in the Manuscript.

Reply:

Few changes have been made in the manuscript as minor correction.

Reviewer 03

1. Abstract: Study time and statistical analysis should be added to Abstract

Reply:

Study time has been included in the method of the abstract. Word limitation of the abstract has restricted the inclusion of statistical analysis.

2. Methods: It is suggested that the Sample inclusion and exclusion criteria and Definitions be merged

Reply: Sample inclusion and exclusion criteria were rearranged and modified without changing the previous basic structure of the methods.

3. Results: Table 2 is long. It is better to summarize and bring only important information.

Reply:

We tried to shorten the length of the table 2 but we found that a short summarized table is not sufficient to represent all the patient-wise comorbidity data clearly. So, we were encouraged to use this long complete table for better understanding.

4. It seems that the first line of the third paragraph (“In this study, 26.7% (N = 157)”) needs to be corrected.

Reply:

The sentence was corrected, accordingly.

5. It seems that the ninth line of the last paragraph (“4 comorbidities: 4.7”) needs to be corrected.

Reply:

The sentence was modified, accordingly.

6. Conclusion: What are the practical recommendations for health policy makers and decision makers regarding the results of this study?

Reply:

This hospital set up was one of the largest private COVID-19 treatment centers in the country. All the local health policy and decision makers along with the senior medical professionals has fully agreed with the results of this study. And this scenario was mostly similar to the experience of other big centers in the country.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 24 Oct 2020

Dear AE,

1- Using a one-sample t-test is not suitable for the data in table 1. Besides it is unknown what the test values are and whether the data are normal or not

2- Table 2 should be deleted. All data in this table are presented in this study

3- What statistical test was used to obtain the p-value in Table 3?

4- In table 3, the row percentages should be presented. Also, the authors should present only one p-value for this table. Besides it is unknown which test was used to analyze the data for this table.

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 24 Oct 2020

Dear EIC

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 29 Oct 2020

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

REPLY TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

Date: 31.10.2020

Reviewer 1:

1- Using one-sample t-test is not suitable for data in table 1. Beside it is unknown what the test values are and the data is normal or not

Reply:

In the table-1, chi-square (χ2) test was used for all the categorical/nominal variables, and one sample t-test was used for continuous variables. We have reviewed our test results and have been confirmed.

2- Table 2 should be deleted. All data in this table is presented in this study

Reply:

Table 2 deleted and the citation in the text is modified.

3-which statistical test was used to obtained the individual p value in table 3?

Reply:

The chi-square (χ2) test was performed for the categorical values in table-03 to obtain a P value.

4- In table 3 the row percentages should be presented. Also the authors should pre4sent only one p value for this table. Beside it is unknown that which test was used to analyzing the data for this table

Reply:

In table-03, all the percentages were mentioned beside the value (n (%)). If further percentage is required to present in particular cases, please suggest us.

The table-3 is divided into 4 different sections. The first section is the number (%) of patients had different quantity of comorbidities (1,2,3,...7) and has a P value. The second section has shown the impact of the number of comorbidities on the ICU requirement with a P value. The third section represented the impact of the number of comorbidities on the demand of mechanical ventilation/intubaton with a P value. And the forth section has showed the impact of the number of comorbidities on the mortality rate in 30-day with a P value.

So, individual section has individual significance level and presented in the table beside each section.

Please suggest us if anything is need to be modified.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 26 Nov 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 27 Nov 2020

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “Minor revision”.
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reply to reviewers' comments (4)_18.1.02021

Q: Your manuscript did not follow the journal's standards, please make it as standard according to the journal terms and bellow Instructions.

R: The manuscript has been modified strictly following the "Author Instruction" of the journal. The changes have been marked as "YELLOW" background color in the text. Changes have been made throughout the manuscript. So, line numbers have not been mentioned separately.

Q: Figures:

Please, mention Figure 2 in the text.

R:"Figure 2" now has been cited in the text and marked as yellow color. (line number 146)

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 30 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewer's comments.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 5 Feb 2021

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, your article has been accepted for publication.
Best Regards