

## Vitamin D level among patients with unexplained musculoskeletal symptoms

Razzaque MA et. al

Type of the review: Anonymous Reviewer/Disclosed Author

### TECHNICAL EDITING

Round 1  
5 December 2023

We want to thank the learned reviewer for his nice review. Our point-by-point response has been attached below:

#### Reviewer's comments

##### Comment 1

It is suggested to add the geographical area and study design in the title to provide a clearer context for the research focus.

##### Response

Thank you so much for the suggestion. However, "Vitamin D level among patients with unexplained musculoskeletal symptoms in Chattogram, Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study" doesn't look good to us. So, we preferred to keep the title as it was before but not rigid to that, editor can choose anyone. Moreover, the geographical area and study design was mentioned in the 1st line of methodology both in the abstract and the body of the manuscript. *Page 2, line 33; Page 5, line 99.*

##### Comment 2

It is better to mention exclusion criteria in the methodology section.

##### Response

As advised, the exclusion criteria have been mentioned in the methods section: Patients having active arthritis, myopathy, connective tissue diseases, trauma, disabilities were excluded through comprehensive clinical, radiological, and laboratory examinations. Other exclusion criteria were renal impairment, liver disease, active infection, pregnancy and patients who were using vitamin D supplementation. *Page 5-6, line 107-111.*

##### Comment 3

It is suggested to mention about the patient who were using a vitamin D supplement.

##### Response

As advised, we have mentioned the exclusion criteria accordingly. *Page 6, line 111.*

##### Comment 4

It's recommended to outline details about blood collection, including the quantity and collection site, storage protocols post-collection, and the time frame for blood analysis.

##### Response

As advised, we have added as follows:

"Blood samples were collected from cubital vein by using regular red-top Vacutainers. Vitamin D analysis was done from fresh serum. It has been mentioned in the methodology section."  
*Page 6, line 116-117.*

##### Comment 5

In line 104, where BMI data was collected, it is better to describe that BMI was calculated from height and weight measurements. Additionally, it's advisable to make comments (in the Discussion section) about the findings using Asian BMI categories.

**Response**

Thanks for the suggestion and we addressed those accordingly.

However, we preferred to keep as it is in the discussion section because changing to Asian criteria will not give any extra insight. *Page 5, line 104; Page 9, line 175; Page 10, line 197.*

**Comment 6**

Consider using full words instead of abbreviations, such as 25-hydroxyvitamin D, instead of 25(OH) (line 113), CMOSH (line 121), Serum 25-OHD (line 215), and wherever abbreviations might be unclear or unfamiliar. This enhances readability and comprehension for a broader audience.

**Response**

All are revised accordingly. *Page 6, line 118, 125; Page 11, line 220.*

**Executive Editor's comments**

**Comment 1**

Lines 36-37: Mentioning the logistic regression would suffice.

**Response**

Thank you so much for the comments. We have corrected accordingly and now it reads: "Descriptive and logistic regression analyses were done." *Page 2, line 36.*

**Comment 2**

Line 95: The use of the STROBE checklist could be mentioned in the Methods section.

**Response**

We have moved as suggested. *Page 7, line 137.*

**Comment 3**

Line 124: Could you use the new name of SPSS?

**Response**

We have revised as mentioned below:

"Statistical Product and Service Solutions". *Page 6, line 128.*

**Comment 4**

Line 182-183: Small sample size not only lacks in generalisability, but it also leads to inadequate power of the statistical tests.

**Response**

We have revised as advised:

'Therefore, has a limitation on adequate power of the statistical tests and generalizability.' *Page 9, line 189.*

Round 2  
5 December 2023

**Executive Editor's comments**

**Comment 1**

The following changes have been made in the manuscript. Please agree with that

1. Corrected all typos in the abstract (e.g mL, interquartile range, kg/m<sup>2</sup> etc.). Added to sentence in the conclusion.
2. Changes all typos specially unit (e.g. mL) throughout the manuscript text and tables.

3. Revised sentence in the 4<sup>th</sup> line of second paragraph of the “Strength and limitations” heading.

**Response**

Thank you so much for the correction and we agree with that. Also, we have checked all unit related typo throughout the manuscript.

**Comment 2**

In the 8<sup>th</sup> line of “Statistical analysis” heading – The factor analysis and PCA used synonymously which is incorrect. The presentation of this paragraph is misleading. We have revised the paragraph. Additionally, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph under the results heading is redundant and misleading. We have removed it. Please agree with that major revision.

**Response**

Thank you so much for this revision. Now it easier to understand and improve the readability.