|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer comments | Author’s response | Location |
| **Reviewer 1**: The authors have sufficiently addressed all the comments and there are no further comments. | We appreciate the reviewer’s kind comments. |  |
| **Reviewer 2**  This paper can help in the COVID-19 crisis. I strongly recommend to publish this research paper asap. | We appreciate the reviewer’s comments. |  |
| **Reviewer 4**   1. In the introduction the sentence "Such measures are variably defined, but generally expand voluntary physical distancing measures through business, school, and workplace closures, restrictions on movement and social gatherings, and imposition of legal penalties for violations. " needs to be referenced(cite:Chirico F, Sacco A, Nucera G, Magnavita N. Coronavirus disease 2019: the second wave in Italy. J Health Res. February 2021 (ahead-of-print). Doi: 10.1108/JHR-10-2020-0514. Chirico F. The role of Health Surveillance for the SARS-CoV-2 Risk Assessment in the Schools. J Occup Environ Med. February 2021 (ahead-of-print). 2021;63(4):e255-e266. Doi: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000002170.   2) The sentence "Counterintuitively, the pandemic has seen a generalized decrease in Emergency Department visits in the United States during pandemic peaks" need to be referenced (cite: Green S, Barry C, Payne B, Holmes J, Xu KT. Association between knowledge and attitude towards COVID-19 and utilization of emergency department care in Texas, United States: a hospital-based study. J Health Soc Sci. 2021;6(2). Forthcoming.  3) In discussion the sentence "This finding is unexpected, given the current focus on acutely deteriorating mental health in various populations", as well as fears of increased suicide rates" need to be more referenced (cite: Chirico F, Nucera G. Tribute to healthcare operators threatened by COVID-19 pandemic. J Health Soc Sci. 2020;5(2):165-168. 10.19204/2020/trbt1 Chirico F, Nucera G, Magnavita N. Protecting the mental health of healthcare workers during the COVID-19 emergency. BJ Psych International. 2020. 1-6.  Doi: 10.1192/bji.2020.39) | 1. The line referred to is already referenced (1,2). We feel the commentary reference suggested by the reviewer does not directly relate to the topic at hand, nor does the second paper with relates to schools. 2. Please note this too is already referenced. 3. Please note that this statement already contains two references (11, 23). The reference mentioned by the reviewer does not seem particularly relevant to mental health in the general population. | Introduction |
| **Reviewer 5**  nice study | Thank you. |  |
| **Reviewer 6**  While the authors have responded to a majority of the comments by the reviewers, there are still some that have not been addressed-especially around the methods, data and the results. Please refer to the original comments by Reviewer 8 and reviewer 12 (#5)  and be sure to address every single one. In your point by point response, it seems that only the first few comments were addressed for reviewer 8, while the remaining ones about the data and the methods were not.  Additionally, I have a few more specific comments for the authors, listed below:  Methods Data: A comparison time period of the year prior (2019) is described in the opening lines of the results, however the methods only describe the pandemic period data (March 5-Sept 5 2020). Please provide a brief description for the comparison data from the year prior.   Statistical analysis Overall, I strongly recommend that the authors consider adding references for the specific methods used  in this analysis for the readers. Most readers of this article will not have a advanced training or experience in these statistical methods and a reference could provide additional information for those who want to learn more.  Please cite a reference for the quasi poisson models so that readers can refer to it to learn more about this type of regression. The rational for not using zero inflated models and negative binomial models seems in response to a reviewer comment and seem out of place in the manuscript text. The authors should consider deleting these sentences. Instead a simple citation or reference for the quasi poisson models would be of more use to the reader  Change point analyses needs to be described in more detail in the methods. Again, I urge the authors to consider adding a citation/ a reference for the reader’s benefit. Similarly a reference should be cited for the PELT methodology and for the “elbow” of the plots as most readers would not be familiar with these methods if they were not a doctoral level statistician. Additionally, please provide a citation for the changepoint R package.  Lastly, in the Figure 1 caption, the authors describe using LOESS to smooth the trend lines; however this method was not described in the statistical methods section. Please add a brief description of this methodology along with appropriate references to the methods section. | Reviewer 12 #5: In the Results section the dates are not consistently reported. The description of Figure 1 in the first paragraph described weeks between 3/5 and 9/5 2020 and figure 2 is purported to report the mental health diagnostic categories for the same period. But the tables that are reporting the various categories represent data from 3/17-5/4 2020 only. Why the reduction in the window of observation for the Poisson regression comparisons. No explanation is provided. | 1. Although data was collected from March 5 to September 5, we specifically examined the March 17 to May 4 period to study the effects of lockdown. We wanted to compare the lockdown period in 2020 to a baseline, so we used the same period in 2019. 2. References for the quasi-Poisson regression have been included, and the extraneous rationale has been removed. 3. References for the PELT method, “elbow” plots, and changepoint package have been included. This should be sufficient to understanding the methodology. 4. A reference for the LOESS method has been included |
| **Reviewer 7**  The Authors have responded to all the suggestions exhaustively. | We appreciate the reviewer’s comments. |  |
| **Reviewer 8**  Thank you for your careful review and response to the reviewer feedback. The revised manuscript is significantly improved and I have no additional comments. | We appreciate the reviewer’s comments. |  |
| **Reviewer 9**  It has improved a lot. | We appreciate the reviewer’s comments. |  |
| **Reviewer 10** Congratulations to authors, they have addressed the limitation of studies very well | We thank the reviewer for his/her comments. |  |
| **Reviewer 11**  I suggested you very minor things, which you did not follow. The topic is the same and introduction, literature and methods are same. However, you have ignored my suggestions. I have declined your paper. | We call the Editor’s attention to our extensive response to this reviewer’s original suggestions, and to our original concerns regarding potential conflict of interest and bad faith. |  |
| **Reviewer 13**  Dear Author  Thank you for your revision. Congratulations to the team for addressing an important issue. | We thank the reviewer for his/her comments. |  |