

Round 1

Rebuttal letter with Resolution of Comments

To,
The Editor
World Journal of Virology

Subject: Rebuttal letter with Resolution of Comments for manuscript no-74566, entitled as “A review of COVID-19 pandemic effects on the distribution of healthcare services in India”.

Respected sir/ Madam,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of our manuscript titled “A review of COVID-19 pandemic effects on the distribution of healthcare services in India” to World Journal of Virology. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers.

Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments and concerns.

Response to Reviewers suggestions

Company Editor-in-chief:

Sr.no.	Reviewer’s comment	Changes completed by authors
1	I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Virology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review	Thank you for your valuable feedback. The PRISMA diagram not required as this is the narrative review. The second Reviewer also commented the same as Not Applicable in Research methods and reporting section.

	Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a figure of the PRISMA to the manuscript.	
--	--	--

#Response to reviewer 1:

Sr.no.	Reviewer's comment	Changes completed by authors
1	A great deal of language polishing	The manuscript has been edited by the professional editing agency

#Response to reviewer 2:

Sr.no	Reviewer's comment	Changes completed by authors
.		
1	Title. Q- Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? A- The title seems good for a narrative review precisely oriented in space, time and issue	No changes required as mentioned by reviewer.
2	Abstract. Q- Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? A- The abstract is in line with the content and title. It outlines the main aspects of the healthcare services from India in facing the COVID-19 pandemic. Is well organized.	No changes required as mentioned by reviewer.
3	Key words. Q- Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Healthcare system, COVID-19,	No changes required as mentioned by reviewer.

	<p>Pandemic, India, Vaccination.</p> <p>A-Keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript</p>	
4	<p>Background.</p> <p>Q-Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study?</p> <p>A-This narrative review aims to analyze the different factors associated with the unavailability of resources in healthcare facilities during the COVID-19 pandemic in India and highlight how the deficiency of essential healthcare services may contribute to the sustainability of the COVID-19 pandemic in India – status and significance of the study is well addressed. Still, comparative presentations with other regions/states in some respects can be included in a paragraph.</p>	<p>Suggested changes done and respective aspects from china and Australia has been added.</p>
5	<p>Methods.</p> <p>Q-Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail?</p> <p>A-The methodology is transparent, but the chosen databases can be exposed.</p>	<p>Databases used in the review has been added i.e. PubMed, EMBASE, Scopus, Google scholar etc.</p>
6	<p>Results.</p> <p>Q-Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Including some diagrams could make easier to transmit the results.</p>	<p>The diagram has been added to transmit the results easily.</p>
7	<p>Discussion.</p>	<p>No changes required as mentioned by</p>

	<p>Q-Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently?</p> <p>A-The manuscript present and discuss narrative findings related to the subject.</p>	reviewer.
8	<p>Illustrations and tables.</p> <p>Q-Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labelling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends?</p> <p>A- Are lacking.</p>	Suggested changes done for labelling and arrows in respective tables and diagrams.
9	<p>Biostatistics.</p> <p>Q-Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?</p> <p>A-Not applicable</p>	Not applicable.
10	<p>Units.</p> <p>Q-Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?</p> <p>A-Not applicable</p>	Not applicable.
11	<p>References.</p> <p>Q-Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? A-The 97 references are adequate, actual and accurate</p>	All references are cited as per the journal guidelines.

	in their use.	
12	<p>Quality of manuscript organization and presentation.</p> <p>Q-Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate?</p> <p>A-The quality for a narrative review is interpreted maybe more subjectively than objectively.</p>	No changes required as mentioned by reviewer.
13	<p>Research methods and reporting.</p> <p>Q-Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting?</p> <p>A-Non of them applicable for a narrative review.</p>	No changes required as mentioned by reviewer.
14	<p>Ethics statements.</p> <p>Q-For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics</p>	Not applicable.

	documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? A-Not applicable	
--	--	--

#Response to reviewer 3:

Sr.no.	Reviewer's comment	Changes completed by authors
1	Interesting narrative review pinpointing several issues. Childhood vaccination disruptions is the most frightening. It is sad to see children risking death in preventable conditions. I would welcome an enlarged discussion here with suggestions on how to. Also it is imperative to press politicians to increase the healthcare budget indeed. At the same time, prevention programs for NCDs are needed.	Thank you for your suggestions. We have modified the background, methods, results and discussion section.

Round 2

Rebuttal letter with Resolution of Comments

To,

The Editor

World Journal of Virology

Subject: Rebuttal letter with Resolution of Comments for manuscript no-74566, entitled as “A review of COVID-19 pandemic effects on the distribution of healthcare services in India”.

Respected sir/ Madam,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of our manuscript titled “A review of COVID-19 pandemic effects on the distribution of healthcare services in India” to World Journal of Virology. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers.

Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments and concerns.

Response to Reviewers suggestions

Company Editor-in-chief:

Sr.no.	Reviewer’s comment	Changes completed by authors
1	In this study, the author draws a conclusion, as follows: The Indian health care system was already under pressure before pandemic. The overburden of patients and essential health services were not handled efficiently. Many healthcare facilities were lacking the basic standards of patient care. The vaccination and chronic disease services were hampered due to the shifting of focus to COVID-19. Perhaps, you should collect more convincing data to prove this conclusion, including other developed and developing countries. Only in this way can you draw such a conclusion.	<p>Thank you for your valuable feedback.</p> <p>Most of this conclusion has been removed which has no references. The other things have been added as a reference in Results section with subheading of “The healthcare situation in India before the pandemic”. In discussion also, special references has been added to address the COVID-19 situation in India and lack of resources during pandemic. Comparison has been added for developed and developing countries under maternal and child health services impact.</p>

