

AUTHOR RESPONSE FORM

Read the following instructions carefully and complete below tables (page 3 onwards) with your responses to the reviewer and editor comments.

Instructions for Authors

- Add each individual comment or suggestion from reviewers and editors to the first column. It is preferable to group comments into general and specific (section-specific) issues.
- If you are responding to more than two reviewers, copy and paste one of the tables and edit the first column to read 'Reviewer C Comment,' for example.
- **Highlight** the changes made in a copy of your revised manuscript. Non-substantive edits like grammar and spelling corrections or replacement of a term or acronym need not be highlighted.
- Add page numbers to your revised manuscript.
- Describe what you have changed in the Author Response column. State the page number where each change can be found. For non-substantive edits occurring in multiple places in the document, you may indicate that changes have been made throughout the manuscript.
- If you feel unable to address a comment or implement a suggestion, or do not agree with a comment, feel free to say so. However, do not simply state your disagreement. Provide as many details as necessary to help the reviewers/editors understand your line of reasoning. Where possible, cite published studies to support your argument.
- It is generally acceptable to make *other* revisions to your paper (i.e., to improve quality and clarity), even those not recommended by the reviewers/editors, provided that these revisions will NOT result in changes to your study purpose, design, findings, and outcomes. After the tables, you can add a few lines explaining any other changes that you have made and why these were necessary. These may include deletions and replacements in the text (e.g., to shorten the manuscript to below the word-count limit).
- Please be mindful of the word-count limit for the article type, excluding figures, tables, and references.

Once done, create a "clean" copy of your revised manuscript without any highlights.

Click on the submission URL (or log on to the journal site and access your submission).

Under the **Review** tab → **Revisions** pane, click **Upload File**.

The screenshot displays the journal submission interface. At the top, the submission ID '8927' and the role 'Author' are visible. The 'Publication' workflow is active. The 'Review' tab is selected and highlighted with a red box. Below the workflow tabs, the 'Round 1' section shows the status 'Round 1 Status: Revisions have been requested.' The 'Notifications' section shows a '[PJCD] Editor Decision' dated 09.02.2024 09:20 PM. The 'Reviewer's Attachments' section shows 'No Files' and a search button. The 'Revisions' section is highlighted with a red box and shows 'No Files' and a search button, with an 'Upload File' button also highlighted with a red box. The 'Review Discussions' section shows 'Add discussion' and a table with columns for Name, From, Last Reply, Replies, and Closed, currently displaying 'No Items'.

Upload* the following files *one at a time*:

- 1) This response document (pdf or doc format)
- 2) Revised version with highlights (file name: **Rev1 HL** in OpenOffice or Microsoft Word file format only); use Rev2 HL, Rev3 HL, etc for subsequent revisions, if any
- 3) Revised clean version (file name: **Rev1** in OpenOffice or Microsoft Word file format only); use Rev2, Rev3, etc for subsequent revisions, if any

*Select **Article Text** as the **Article Component** type for all. Complete Steps 2 and 3 of the upload. When uploading the 2nd and 3rd files, choose “**This is not a revision of an existing file**” to avoid overwriting (replacing) the previous uploads. Once done, check the **Revisions** pane to verify that all three (3) files were uploaded.

The image shows two screenshots of the 'Upload Review File' dialog box. The left screenshot is in the '1. Upload File' step. It has a dropdown menu for 'Article Component *' with 'Article Text' selected. Below it is a dashed box for file upload with an 'Upload File' button. The right screenshot is in the '2. Review Details' step. It has a dropdown menu for 'Article Component *' with 'Article Text' selected. Below it is a dropdown menu for 'If you are uploading a revision of an existing file, please indicate which file.' with 'This is not a revision of an existing file' selected. Below that is a file list showing 'Response document.docx' with a 'Change File' button. A green arrow points from the left screenshot to the right one.

TIPS

- Consider reviewer and editor comments carefully - don't rush!
- Submit your revision on time
- Be positive and constructive
- Be polite and respectful even when disagreeing
- Keep your comments clear and concise
- Comprehensive updates and responses to reviewer and editor comments will minimize the need for future revisions

You may check the following references to guide you in the response:

[How to respond to a “revise and resubmit” decision from a journal: 10 steps to a successful revision](#)

[Do's and Don'ts for responding to peer reviewers' comments](#)

[How to respond to comments by peer reviewers](#)

[Tips for authors submitting a revised manuscript](#)

[How to revise and resubmit the manuscript after a favorable peer review](#)

For some examples on how to respond to editors' and reviewers' comments,

[A template for responding to peer review comments](#)

[Sample response to reviewers](#)

[BMJ author response](#)

*If you have any questions to the editor related to the review of your manuscript, click **Add Discussion** under **Review Discussions**, select self and the assigned Associate Editor as **Participants**, type in your message, and click **OK**.*

MANUSCRIPT ID:
MANUSCRIPT TITLE:

EDITOR COMMENT	AUTHOR RESPONSE	PAGE NUMBER
e.g., The criteria for COVID severity should be uniform worldwide (objective parameters)	e.g., Added section under methodology defining the COVID-classification as per DOH guidelines (from DOH Circular No. 2022-002)	4-5
e.g. METHODOLOGY Usually INR results matter more than PT and the former is usually the basis for treatment	e.g., This was a limitation of this study because it reviewed only the initial coagulation and platelet results of the study population. The results were taken before any treatment was given to the patient. Kindly refer to page 8, 2nd to last paragraph	10-12

REVIEWER A COMMENT	AUTHOR RESPONSE	PAGE NUMBER
e.g. XXXX is a more appropriate term to use	e.g., Accordingly, throughout the manuscript, we have revised the terms used	Multiple places

REVIEWER B COMMENT	AUTHOR RESPONSE	PAGE NUMBER