

# Review of draft 1 complaints

ghoshaakash222

August 30, 2023

## 1 Summary

1. The quality of the writing needs enhancement; it's advisable to consult a native English speaker.  
**We simply need to run this through a grammar checker. Grammarly or chat-gpt should be enough**
2. The objective does not mention anything about the COVID-19 pandemic, meanwhile the title do, please change.  
**Again, simple change**
3. In the results section, it is not clear, how the percentage was obtained when you say: "Inpatient care was required for 1,817 (0.8%) patients". Please, specify if you refer to the fact that, of all the patients who were hospitalized, 0.8% were seen for a dermatological reason, or, if of all the dermatological patients seen in the outpatient clinic, 0.8% corresponded to those who required hospitalization.
4. In the conclusions section, you mention: "The large number of admissions observed in our study highlights the need for a specialized dermatological unit within a facility of tertiary care", but in the results the prevalence of dermatological diseases is only 0.8%, please give support to this opinion.

## 2 Introduction

5. This section requires reworking as it lacks a distinct outline of the intended investigation and lacks context explaining the underlying motivations for the study. For example, you do not mention anything about the COVID-19 pandemic and how, in other studies, this impacted in hospital admissions, when these are the objectives of the study.  
**Impact of COVID-19 in hospital admissions were mentioned in thre results section :**

The highest number of admissions occurred in 2019, followed by a significant decline in 2020 and a gradual increase in subsequent years (747 (1.05%) in 2019, 207 (0.61%) in 2020, 406 (0.71%) in 2021, and 457 (0.7%) in 2022).

**And the effects were presented in tables. Still, if this is what is wanted, should be a small change**

### 3 Material and methods

6. You only mention “COVID”, instead of “COVID-19 pandemic”, please change. Improve wording, you mention: “(a) pre/post-pandemic period (1st January 2019 - 31st January 2020 and 1st March 2021 - 31st December 2022) and (b) pandemic period (1st February 2020 - 28th February 2021), this is confusing. We suggest: “(a) pre-pandemic period (1st January 2019 - 31st January 2020); (b) pandemic period (1st February 2020 - 28th February 2021) and (c) post-pandemic period (1st March 2021 - 31st December 2022).

**Minor change**

### 4 Results

7. Please confirm the statistical analysis, because it is very hard to believe that the comparison the difference between “Males (1000, 55.04%) and females (817, 44.96%)”, has such a significant difference with a  $p = 0.005$ .

**For this we used chi squared goodness of fit.**

Enter sample data

Categories	Observed Frequency	*Expected Value
Category-1	1000	0.51759834368
Category-2	817	0.48240165632

\*Choose Expected Frequencies or Expected Probabilities.  
The sum of the **expected values** must be equal to the sum of the **observed frequencies** or to **one**.

Calculate Insert row Delete row Clear

[How to do with R?](#)

### Results


Categories	Observed Frequencies	Expected Value
Category-1	1000	940.48
Category-2	817	876.52

The expected values should be at least 1 for all the values, and at least 5 for 80% of the values  
**Blue** - less than 5, but still okay.  
**Red** - potential issue.

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(1000-940.48)^2}{940.48} + \frac{(817-876.52)^2}{876.52} = 7.81$$

P-value =  $1 - p(\chi^2(1) \leq 7.81)$ .

k	2	Number of categories
n	1817	Sample size
$\chi^2$	7.809529	Chi square test statistic
DF	1	df = k-m-1 = 2-0-1 = 1
Phi effect ( $\Phi$ )	0.0655594	$\Phi = \sqrt{\chi^2/n}$



**Goodness of fit, using  $\chi^2$  distribution (right-tailed) (validation)**

**1.  $H_0$  hypothesis**  
 Since p-value <  $\alpha$ ,  $H_0$  is rejected.  
 The statistical model does not fit the observations

- Please follow the journal guidelines for authors. The figures are not numbered and the legend is not at the end of the document, separated from the figures, as indicated.

**Minor change**

- In Table 1 you must specify the meaning of the words: "PLEVA", "SLE", "MCTD", "STI", "ADR", "TEN", "HSP", "BCC" and "SCC"

**Minor change**

- It is worrisome that patients with a "lichen simplex chronicus" and "giant molluscum contagiosum" diagnosis have longer median hospital stays than those of "pemphigus vulgaris". Could you please give an explanation for this?
- Could you please explain why for diseases with only one patient (pityriasis rosea, lichen simplex chronicus, DRESS syndrome, kerion, SCC) a median

statistic was calculated, how was it obtained?

**While claculation of central tendency is non standard for samples with single data point, we did it for the sake of completeness. If needed, we can remove it too!**

12. You mention: “The mean length of admission was  $9.6 \pm 10.2$  (median: 6; range: 1 to 81) days”, what is the reason for obtaining both mean and median?

**The standard deviation was noted to be quite high, sometimes even greater than the mean. This suggests an inherent skewness in the data, which needed attention in our opinions.**

## 5 Discussion and Bib

Minor changes