

Peer Review Report

Review Report on The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on People with Lymphedema in an Endemic Area for Lymphatic Filariasis in Brazil

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Bijit Biswas

Submitted on: 17 Sep 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605317

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

The study compared sociodemographic and clinical aspects, risk of falling, and quality of life, both prior to and during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, in 28 patients with lymphedema of the lower limbs, older than 18 years old and in the investigation of filarial infection. It observed an increase in interdigital lesions, dermal lesions, a higher frequency of acute dermato-lymphangio-adenitis crises and risk of falling, worsening of quality of life in the domains of functional capacity, general health status, vitality, and mental health with the pandemic.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

As a limitation of the study, in obtaining information on hygiene maintenance, there may have been a memory bias, given that the data obtained in 2021 referred to the entire first year of the pandemic. This information was complemented with an In review detailed clinical examination of the affected limb.

The study has shown information concerning social, clinical, and quality of life issues among lymphedema patients residing in an endemic area of filariasis during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

The study compared sociodemographic and clinical aspects, risk of falling, and quality of life, both prior to and during the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic, in 28 patients with lymphedema of the lower limbs, older than 18 years old and in the investigation of filarial infection. Although there were some issues which need to be addressed before proceeding further.

In the abstract,

The methodology should include study type, design, and duration.

In results, report and include major significant and non-significant ones preferably with p values

In Introduction

It is ok, although might be shortened removing unnecessary discussions. The route of spread and prevention of COVID-19 is known to all.

In methodology

How it can be a descriptive study when authors deployed statistical tests

The study design is also not clearly mentioned

How was the sample size determined for the study

Report sensitivity and specificity of the used diagnostic tests

The research protocol is not a heading rather than definitions used may be stated
In statistical analysis, what data test was used should be mentioned clearly. For pre-post categorical data, McNemar Test should be used. For pre-post, continuous data paired t-test (with mean and SD) and Wilcoxon matched pair signed rank test (with median and IQR) based on normality should be used. The test used for normality ascertainment should also be stated.

Results,

It is ok but needs to be modified based on statistical tests used with minimum duplication between table and text.

Discussion:

To be modified as per results

References

It is not uniform

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

No, should be as per MeSH terms

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes, but might be improved

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes, It is not uniform

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Major revisions.