

**Assessment of health-related quality of life of COVID-19 patients during follow-up**Sharmin E et al. ([elora.sharmin@bsmmu.edu.bd](mailto:elora.sharmin@bsmmu.edu.bd))

Reviewer's information			
Date review assigned	31-Aug-22	Date review returned	18-Sept-22
Reviewer name	A	Affiliation	-
Email	-	ORCID	-
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	No

Reviewer's comments (21-Sept-22)	Author's response (05-Dec-22)
<b>Descriptive comments</b> to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).	Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.
<p><b>MAJOR Points</b> This is an important piece of work. The paper presents the analysis of Health-Related Quality of Life of COVID-19 patients. My comments are below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The methods section need elaboration. It needs to address the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which hospital was selected for the study and why?</li> <li>b. Who collected data?</li> <li>c. How subjects with normal health in different sex were selected?</li> <li>d. What model was used for the regression analysis? How the dependent variables were chosen? How data was analyzed?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Table II in result section needs elaboration. How HRQoL outcomes were estimated for COVID19 patients and subjects with normal health of the different sexes is not clear, hence Table II remains unclear. Population norm, normative group – these are not defined in methods.</li> <li>3. Discussion section can refer to any similar studies carried out in other countries. If no such studies were found, that can be mentioned.</li> </ol>	<p>We appreciate your positive feedback on the significance of the study. I have diligently addressed the major points you raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Methods section <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Included information on why a specific hospital was chosen for the study.</li> <li>b. Details about the data collection team have been added.</li> <li>c. The process of selecting subjects with normal health in different sexes has been elaborated.</li> <li>d. Clarified the regression analysis model used, the rationale for choosing dependent variables, and explained how data was analyzed.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Table II and results: Have provided additional details in Table II to explain how HRQoL outcomes were estimated for COVID-19 patients and subjects with normal health of different sexes. Definitions for population norm and normative group have been added to the methods section for clarity.</li> <li>3. Additionally, in the Discussion section, I have referred to similar studies carried out in other countries where applicable. In cases where no such studies were found, this has been explicitly mentioned.</li> </ol>
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b>	Major revision

## Second round

Executive Editor's comments (06-Apr-23)	Author's response (09-Apr-23)
<p>The manuscript still need to address the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attach point-by-point response to reviewer's comments in the journal's designated format (attached).</li> <li>2. Give a short title and reduce the word count to 250 words in abstract.</li> <li>3. Highlights- doesn't reflect the title and findings, need to revise.</li> <li>4. Referencing- Is not correct (combination of superscript and normal text, few have parenthesis, and others do not).</li> <li>5. Methods- The following reviewers' comments are not properly addressed.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which hospital was selected for the study and why?</li> <li>b. Who collected data?</li> <li>c. How subjects with normal health in different sex were selected?</li> <li>d. What model was used for the regression analysis? How the dependent variables were chosen?</li> <li>e. How data was analyzed?</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. Result - The following reviewer's comments are not properly addressed "Table II in result section needs elaboration. How HRQoL outcomes were estimated for COVID19 patients and subjects with normal health of the different sexes is not clear, hence Table II remains unclear. Population norm, normative group – these are not defined in methods."</li> <li>7. Discussion - The following reviewer's comments are not properly addressed "Discussion section can refer to any similar studies carried out in other countries. If no such studies were found, that can be mentioned. "</li> <li>8. Acknowledgement- is not properly written.</li> <li>9. An orphan paragraph has been found just before the table 1.</li> </ol>	<p>Please see the revised point:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Given point-by-point response to reviewer's comments in the journal's designated format.</li> <li>2. A short title has given in page- 1, line 4; Reduced the word count of the abstract as advised.</li> <li>3. Highlights has been revised (Page-3, line 6).</li> <li>4. References are corrected and uniformed.</li> <li>5. Methods  Revised the methods section as advised in a to e (lines 116-130).</li> <li>6. Provided additional clarification in Table II to explain how HRQoL outcomes were estimated for COVID-19 patients and subjects with normal health of different sexes. Definitions for population norm and normative group have been added to the methods section for transparency. (lines 116-130).</li> <li>7. We have included references to similar studies carried out in other countries where applicable. If no such studies were found, this is explicitly mentioned. (page 7, lines 156-204).</li> <li>8. Revised the Acknowledgments (page 9, line 215).</li> <li>9. Merged with the main text under Results section.</li> </ol>

## Third round

Executive Editor's comments (10-Apr-23)	Author's response (13-Apr-23)
<p>Thank you for sharing the revised manuscript. However, your manuscript has plagiarized text (attached report). Please remove as much as possible.</p>	<p>Corrected and revised.</p>

## Fourth round

<b>Executive Editor's comments (06-May23)</b>	<b>Author's response (11-May-23)</b>
<p>The following points might be taken into account for revising the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Revise the data analysis sub-section according to the results presented.</li><li>2. Lines 150-151: Results given in Tables 3 and 4 are jointly cited in the text in one sentence. Please write separate sentences for each table.</li><li>3. For the ORs given in the sample tables, the proportions for each category should be shown in the same table or a separate table before the appearance of these tables. Your tables do not provide the reference category (usually 1 or reference). Please make it clear.</li><li>4. Citation to all recent articles published in Bangladesh should be given.</li></ol>	<p>As per requirement and comment of the reviewer we have corrected our manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Revised the data analysis sub-section to align with the presented results for clarity and accuracy.</li><li>2. Separated the sentences to distinctly cite the results from Tables 3 and 4.</li><li>3. Included proportions for each category in the sample tables. Additionally, we have clearly indicated the reference category in the tables.</li><li>4. I have ensured that recent articles published in Bangladesh are cited appropriately, providing a more comprehensive and up-to-date literature review.</li></ol>

## Fifth round

<b>Executive Editor's comments (24-May23)</b>	<b>Author's response (10-Jun-23)</b>
<p>We have come up with final decision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Please revise your manuscript into a "Brief article" (see the word count from the submission checklist attached).</li><li>2. The total number is inconsistent in Table 1, re-check it and give an explanation in the footnote of the table.</li><li>3. Please note that the journal office has made a few modifications to the manuscript, particularly to the tables. Do your further revision on the attached version of the manuscript.</li></ol>	<p>Thank you for your final decision and guidance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. We have revised the manuscript to fit the format of a "Brief article".</li><li>2. Rechecked and revised the total numbers in Table 1 and provided explanation in the footnote of the table as necessary.</li><li>3. I have carefully reviewed the modifications made by the journal office, particularly to the tables, and have incorporated further revisions in alignment with the attached version of the manuscript.</li></ol>