

## RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENT

To WJV Editor

### Reviewer#1

**Comments:** The definition of multidisciplinary is missing from the article. Despite the authors citing multidisciplinary, they were restricted to the health area and other professionals linked to the health area. In this period there were important contributions by biochemists (vaccines), biomedical, engineers (equipment such as respirators), mathematicians (statisticians), physiotherapists and several other professionals, using these professionals would constitute a multidisciplinary. According to the article, the concept of multidisciplinary is very limited. In the way it is, in my opinion, the article consists of a convergence of some health-related areas. Thus, this definition is important. Authors should rethink the title and the purpose of the article, mainly in relation to multidisciplinary. Despite the "Introduction" proposing a collaborative approach, this approach was not clear in the text. What would be the result intended by the authors, I did not understand. Despite being in the title and in the conclusion, multidisciplinary was little highlighted in the text. A major flaw and concern in relation to the article lies in the "Methods". A systematic review has guidelines that must be obeyed. The terms and logical connectors used for the search must be better identified. What was the number of articles used in the systematic review? How many articles were discarded and what were the reasons? The quality of the articles included was not presented. What study designs were analyzed? Another major concern was regarding the search source, the authors searched only at PUBMED. How many authors participated in the selection of articles? How were the differences in the selection of articles resolved? How many authors did the data collection? How were the differences in data collection resolved? "Results and Discussion" presented are very useful, but a table showing the authors, methods and conclusion of the articles included in this systematic review would be very important.

**Response:** Thank you very much for your helpful comment which without any doubt contribute to improve the scientific quality of our manuscript. In fact, in the submitted manuscript we intended to present a none systematic literature review and related methodology. We've qualitatively summarized useful informations on a rapidly evolving COVID-19 pandemic using existing reviews (including systematic) and emerging research (including primary research) to collect and interpret evidence. In this point of view, summarizing literature on COVID-19 pandemic is our key intention.

Despite we agree to the fact that a systematic review would be still better increasing the level of the manuscript scientific quality.

About multidisciplinary approach we agree with your remark, because in our work this concept is restricted to the health and related areas even if in the results/discussion section we consider the transversality of scientific research. That's

why we've submitted the text to WJV. Despite this should be specified in the text. By consequent, except your disagreement we've replaced the term "multidisciplinary" in the title as well as in the text by the term "pluralistic". In addition, we've noticed a paragraph in the conclusion section as follow: "Our results argue for and illustrate the pluralistic approach in managing COVID-19 a fortiori in relation to health and related fields. This work would be even more comprehensive if the search source were larger, the collaborative approach more detailed, and the pluralistic approach extended to complementary disciplines such as: biochemistry (vaccines), statistics and mathematics (modelling?), biomedical science and biotechnology, inventions (respirators, ventilation equipment), physical therapy, etc.". To note the collaborative approach is suggested, based on the results/discussion section content which illustrates the need for competences or knowledge's integration for an effective response.

We even inserted a flow chart of article search method.

## **Reviewer#2**

**Comments:** The good and original study in the COVID-19 pandemic. It can be accepted.

**Response:** Thanks for your comments.