

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Clinical Profile and Outcome Analysis of Ear-Nose-Throat Symptoms in SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Subvariant Infections

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Ugochukwu Anthony Eze

Submitted on: 25 Aug 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606403

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Aim of this study was to investigate the clinical characteristics and outcomes of ear-nose-throat (ENT) symptoms in SARS-CoV-2 infected patients from local transmission. Female patients are more likely to experience various ENT symptoms with greater severity than males. This was also dependent on time

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Section 3.2 to 3.4 dwelt mainly on incidence this is a cross sectional study, the word incidence should be used with caution. Not particularly wrong but authors should ensure the definition of incidence is well considered. Ideal incidence study is cohort or follow up study

#### **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.

Introduction – the objective of this study was not clearly stated. It should be as clear as it was in the abstract. As this is the basis upon which the study can be assessed.

Line 50–51 – Mentioning convenience sampling is already stating the method of this study in a place study objectives should be stated. All be it not clearly stated

Line 67 – Please state the hospital . The asterisk \* already suggests incomplete information

Line 117 – The first sentence , January 19 – February 11, 2023 is redundant. This should be in the method. Not needed in the result section

Line 128 – please how many constitute 78.4%? Kindly state it and put the % in a bracket. This should apply to other percentages in this section.

Section 3.2, 3.3, & 3.4 – Authors consistently mentioned incidence. Though it's plausible to find incidence in cross sectional studies. The ideal incidence study design is cohort study.

Please how can the authors convince readers that this is actually incidence going by the definition of incidence which the number of new cases of a disease in a population over a given time. Authors should kindly crosscheck this fact.

PLEASE COMMENT

**Q 4** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes

**Q 5** Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes

**Q 6** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

But should add Omicron

**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

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:

Minor revisions.