

View Letter

Close

Date: Jul 02 2021 02:28AM
To: "Erni Nelwan" e.nelwan@gmail.com;nikodemushosea@yahoo.com
From: "PLOS ONE" plosone@plos.org
Subject: Submission Confirmation for PONE-D-21-21595

PONE-D-21-21595
Clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 patients in Bali, Indonesia
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr. Nelwan,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript entitled 'Clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 patients in Bali, Indonesia' to PLOS ONE. Your assigned manuscript number is PONE-D-21-21595.

We will now begin processing your manuscript and may contact you if we require any further information. You will receive an update once your manuscript passes our in-house technical check; you can also check the status of your manuscript by logging into your account at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/>.

If during submission you selected the option for your manuscript to be posted on the bioRxiv preprint server (<http://biRxiv.org>), we will be assessing the manuscript for suitability shortly. If suitable, your preprint will be made publicly available on bioRxiv and you will receive an email confirmation from them when it has posted. Please check your response to this question and email us as soon as possible at plosone@plos.org if it has been answered incorrectly. Further information about our partnership with bioRxiv to facilitate the rapid availability of life sciences research is available at <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/preprints>.

If you have any inquiries or other comments regarding this manuscript please contact plosone@plos.org.

Thank you for your support of PLOS ONE.

Kind regards,
PLOS ONE

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Close

View Letter

Close

Date: Jun 02 2022 11:13AM
To: "Erni Juwita Nelwan" e.nelwan@gmail.com;nikodemushosea@yahoo.com
"Ketut Sutarjana" ketutsutarjana123@gmail.com, "Rois Muqsith Fatawy" rois.muqsith@gmail.com, "Surya Wibawa" suryawibawa_education@yahoo.co.id, "Putu Arya Nugraha" internistariya@yahoo.com, "Jarwa Antara" jarwaantara@gmail.com, "Adi Suparta" caknyo@yahoo.com, "DG Wedha Asmara" on.wedha@gmail.com, "LG Sri Yenny" sriyenny82@yahoo.com, "AAG Budhitresna" agbudhitresna@yahoo.com, "Dewi Arimas" dewiarimas@ymail.com, "Dewi Indriani" dr.dewi.indriyani45@gmail.com, "Kmg Parwata" komparta08@yahoo.com, "Eka Sugiartha" ekasugiartha@gmail.com, "Siska Kahari" siskakahari@gmail.com, "Sri Masyeni" masyeniputu@yahoo.com, "Clareza Arief Wardhana" clareza.arief@yahoo.com, "AAG Indraningrat" anak.indraningrat@gmail.com, "Kadek Mulyantari" kadek_mulyantari@unud.ac.id, "Arya Widiyana Pasek" aryawp.1610@gmail.com, "Oka Putrawan" okaputrawan@gmail.com, "Nyoman Trisna Yustiani" trisna_yustiani@yahoo.co.id, "Gede Wardana" wardanagedejuga@gmail.com, "Made Indra Wijaya" madeindrawijaya@gmail.com, "Suka Aryana" aryanasuka@yahoo.com, "Yuli Gayatri" yuligayatri@gmail.com, "Dewi Dian Sukmawati" dewidian.sukmawati@yahoo.com, "Ketut Suastika" ksuas55@gmail.com, "Tuti Parwati Merati" tutiparwati@yahoo.com, "Made Bakta" madebakta@yahoo.com, "Raka Widiana" rakawidiana@yahoo.com
From: "PLOS ONE" plosone@plos.org
Subject: Notification of Formal Acceptance for PONE-D-21-21595R2

PONE-D-21-21595R2
Clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 patients in Bali, Indonesia

Dear Dr. Nelwan:

I'm pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been deemed suitable for publication in PLOS ONE. Congratulations! Your manuscript is now with our production department.

If your institution or institutions have a press office, please let them know about your upcoming paper now to help maximize its impact. If they'll be preparing press materials, please inform our press team within the next 48 hours. Your manuscript will remain under strict press embargo until 2 pm Eastern Time on the date of publication. For more information please contact onepress@plos.org.

If we can help with anything else, please email us at plosone@plos.org.

Thank you for submitting your work to PLOS ONE and supporting open access.

Kind regards,
PLOS ONE Editorial Office Staff

on behalf of
Dr. Nguyen Tien Huy
Academic Editor
PLOS ONE

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Close

View Letter

Close

Date: May 13 2022 01:15PM
To: "Erni Juwita Nelwan" e.nelwan@gmail.com;nikodemushosea@yahoo.com
"Sri Masyeni" masyeniputu@yahoo.com, "Rois Muqith Fatawy" rois.muqith@gmail.com, "Surya Wibawa" suryawibawa_education@yahoo.co.id, "Putu Arya Nugraha" internistariya@yahoo.com, "Jarwa Antara" jarwaantara@gmail.com, "Adi Suparta" caknyo@yahoo.com, "DG Wedha Asmara" on.wedha@gmail.com, "LG Sri Yenny" sriyenny82@yahoo.com, "AAG Budhitesna" agbudhitesna@yahoo.com, "Dewi Arimas" dewiarimas@gmail.com, "Dewi Indriani" dr.dewi.indriyani45@gmail.com, "Kmg Parwata" komparta08@yahoo.com, "Sutarjana Sutarjana" ketutsutarjana123@gmail.com, "Eka Sugiarta" ekasugiarta@gmail.com, "Siska Kahari" siskakahari@gmail.com, "Clareza Arief Wardhana" clareza.arief@yahoo.com, "AAG Indraningrat" anak.indraningrat@gmail.com, "Kadek Mulyantari" kadek_mulyantari@unud.ac.id, "Arya Widiyana Pasek" aryawp.1610@gmail.com, "Oka Putrawan" okaputrawan@gmail.com, "Nyoman Trisna Yustiani" trisna_yustiani@yahoo.co.id, "Gede Wardana" wardanagedejuga@gmail.com, "Made Indra Wijaya" madeindrawijaya@gmail.com, "Suka Aryana" ariyanasuka@yahoo.com, "Yuli Gayatri" yuligayatri@gmail.com, "Dewi Dian Sukmawati" dewidian.sukmawati@yahoo.com, "Ketut Suastika" ksuas55@gmail.com, "Tuti Parwati Merati" tutiparwati@yahoo.com, "Made Bakta" madebakta@yahoo.com, "Raka Widiana" rakawidiana@yahoo.com
cc:
From: "PLOS ONE" plosone@plos.org
Subject: PONE-D-21-21595R2: Final Decision Being Processed

Clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 patients in Bali, Indonesia
PONE-D-21-21595R2

Dear Dr. Nelwan,

We're pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been judged scientifically suitable for publication and will be formally accepted for publication once it meets all outstanding technical requirements and your correction on the minor comments.

Within one week, you'll receive an e-mail detailing the required amendments. When these have been addressed, you'll receive a formal acceptance letter and your manuscript will be scheduled for publication.

An invoice for payment will follow shortly after the formal acceptance. To ensure an efficient process, please log into Editorial Manager at <http://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/>, click the 'Update My Information' link at the top of the page, and double check that your user information is up-to-date. If you have any billing related questions, please contact our Author Billing department directly at authorbilling@plos.org.

If your institution or institutions have a press office, please notify them about your upcoming paper to help maximize its impact. If they'll be preparing press materials, please inform our press team as soon as possible -- no later than 48 hours after receiving the formal acceptance. Your manuscript will remain under strict press embargo until 2 pm Eastern Time on the date of publication. For more information, please contact onepress@plos.org.

Kind regards,

Nguyen Tien Huy, M.D., Ph.D.,
Academic Editor
PLOS ONE

Additional Editor Comments (optional):

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer's Responses to Questions

Comments to the Author

1. If the authors have adequately addressed your comments raised in a previous round of review and you feel that this manuscript is now acceptable for publication, you may indicate that here to bypass the "Comments to the Author" section, enter your conflict of interest statement in the "Confidential to Editor" section, and submit your "Accept" recommendation.

Reviewer #1: All comments have been addressed

Reviewer #2: All comments have been addressed

Reviewer #3: All comments have been addressed

2. Is the manuscript technically sound, and do the data support the conclusions?

The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: Partly

3. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: Yes

4. Have the authors made all data underlying the findings in their manuscript fully available?

The [PLOS Data policy](#) requires authors to make all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript fully available without restriction, with rare exception (please refer to the Data Availability Statement in the manuscript PDF file). The data should be provided as part of the manuscript or its supporting information, or deposited to a public repository. For example, in addition to summary statistics, the data points behind means, medians and variance measures should be available. If there are restrictions on publicly sharing data—e.g. participant privacy or use of data from a third party—those must be specified.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: Yes

5. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?

PLOS ONE does not copyedit accepted manuscripts, so the language in submitted articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. Any typographical or grammatical errors should be corrected at revision, so please note any specific errors here.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: No

6. Review Comments to the Author

Please use the space provided to explain your answers to the questions above. You may also include additional comments for the author, including concerns about dual publication, research ethics, or publication ethics. (Please upload your review as an attachment if it exceeds 20,000 characters)

Reviewer #1: This article can be accepted by the journal. The author has addressed all my comments

Thank you for your great work!

Reviewer #2: Thank you for addressing the comments. I believe the manuscript is fit for publication after the edits. Good

Reviewer #2: Thank you for addressing the comments. I believe the manuscript is fit for publication after the edits. Good luck to the authors.

Reviewer #3: Authors did a great job revising the manuscript but still there are certain considerations for example:

- In the heading- Study setting Line no. 95-100 authors have defined the classification of groups. This was repeated again from line 108 to 110.
- Line no: 162- "pneumonia non-COVID-19" could be written as pneumonia (non-COVID)

7. PLOS authors have the option to publish the peer review history of their article ([what does this mean?](#)). If published, this will include your full peer review and any attached files.

If you choose "no", your identity will remain anonymous but your review may still be made public.

Do you want your identity to be public for this peer review? For information about this choice, including consent withdrawal, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Reviewer #1: **Yes:** Van Phu Tran

Reviewer #2: **Yes:** Abdelrahman M Makram

Reviewer #3: **Yes:** Zeeshan Ali Khan

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. ([Remove my information/details](#)). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Close

View Letter

Close

Date: Mar 09 2022 10:37AM
To: "Erni Juwita Nelwan" e.nelwan@gmail.com;nikodemushosea@yahoo.com
From: "PLOS ONE" plosone@plos.org
Subject: PLOS ONE Decision: Revision required [PONE-D-21-21595R1]

PONE-D-21-21595R1
Clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 patients in Bali, Indonesia
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr. Nelwan,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to PLOS ONE. After careful consideration, we feel that it has merit but does not fully meet PLOS ONE's publication criteria as it currently stands. Therefore, we invite you to submit a revised version of the manuscript that addresses the points raised during the review process, especially on the data analysis. Please describe more in detail the methods of multivariable regression analysis. How did the authors include factors in the model?

In addition, the authors need to follow the reporting STROBE guidelines published in this link:
https://www.equator-network.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/STROBE_checklist_v4_combined.pdf
A checklist should be submitted as a supplemental file.

Please submit your revised manuscript by Apr 23 2022 11:59PM. If you will need more time than this to complete your revisions, please reply to this message or contact the journal office at plosone@plos.org. When you're ready to submit your revision, log on to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/> and select the 'Submissions Needing Revision' folder to locate your manuscript file.

Please include the following items when submitting your revised manuscript:

- A rebuttal letter that responds to each point raised by the academic editor and reviewer(s). You should upload this letter as a separate file labeled 'Response to Reviewers'.
- A marked-up copy of your manuscript that highlights changes made to the original version. You should upload this as a separate file labeled 'Revised Manuscript with Track Changes'.
- An unmarked version of your revised paper without tracked changes. You should upload this as a separate file labeled 'Manuscript'.

If you would like to make changes to your financial disclosure, please include your updated statement in your cover letter. Guidelines for resubmitting your figure files are available below the reviewer comments at the end of this letter.

If applicable, we recommend that you deposit your laboratory protocols in protocols.io to enhance the reproducibility of your results. Protocols.io assigns your protocol its own Identifier (DOI) so that it can be cited independently in the future. For instructions see: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/submission-guidelines#loc-laboratory-protocols>. Additionally, PLOS ONE offers an option for publishing peer-reviewed Lab Protocol articles, which describe protocols hosted on protocols.io. Read more information on sharing protocols at https://plos.org/protocols?utm_medium=editorial-email&utm_source=authorletters&utm_campaign=protocols.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,

Nguyen Tien Huy, Ph.D., M.D.
Academic Editor
PLOS ONE

Journal Requirements:

Please review your reference list to ensure that it is complete and correct. If you have cited papers that have been retracted, please include the rationale for doing so in the manuscript text, or remove these references and replace them with relevant current references. Any changes to the reference list should be mentioned in the rebuttal letter that accompanies your revised manuscript. If you need to cite a retracted article, indicate the article's retracted status in the References list and also include a citation and full reference for the retraction notice.

[Note: HTML markup is below. Please do not edit.]

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer's Responses to Questions

Comments to the Author

1. If the authors have adequately addressed your comments raised in a previous round of review and you feel that this manuscript is now acceptable for publication, you may indicate that here to bypass the "Comments to the Author" section, enter your conflict of interest statement in the "Confidential to Editor" section, and submit your "Accept" recommendation.

Reviewer #1: All comments have been addressed

Reviewer #2: All comments have been addressed

Reviewer #3: (No Response)

2. Is the manuscript technically sound, and do the data support the conclusions?

The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Partly

Reviewer #3: Partly

3. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: Yes

4. Have the authors made all data underlying the findings in their manuscript fully available?

The [PLOS Data policy](#) requires authors to make all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript fully available without restriction, with rare exception (please refer to the Data Availability Statement in the manuscript PDF file). The data should be provided as part of the manuscript or its supporting information, or deposited to a public repository. For example, in addition to summary statistics, the data points behind means, medians and variance measures should be available. If there are restrictions on publicly sharing data—e.g. participant privacy or use of data from a third party—those must be specified.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: Yes

5. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?

PLOS ONE does not copyedit accepted manuscripts, so the language in submitted articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. Any typographical or grammatical errors should be corrected at revision, so please note any specific errors here.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: No

6. Review Comments to the Author

Please use the space provided to explain your answers to the questions above. You may also include additional comments for the author, including concerns about dual publication, research ethics, or publication ethics. (Please upload your review as an attachment if it exceeds 20,000 characters)

Reviewer #1: Thank you for your great effort. Your team edited and clarified the comments of the reviewers and editors very well, but some points must be defined or fixed.

1. Please clarify the aim of the study with the specific study population in that sentence: "This study aimed to compare clinical and laboratory manifestations of disparity between COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 patients."
2. Please check for grammatical errors and ensure that all manuscripts are written in standard English.
3. Please indicate a number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest.
4. Please check carefully the STROBE checklist for the cross-sectional study and fill in the missing parts.

Reviewer #2: Thanks for sending the manuscript back after the revision. The authors have done a great job in addressing the comments. There are still some major proofreading errors. I will give some examples here (please note that all line numbers are from the non-clean version):

1. Line 34: it should be "may vary" instead of "might be varied".
2. Line 41: it should be "compared".
4. Line 44: it's better to be like this: COVID-19 patients (45 non-severe and 6 severe). Because is not appropriate here.
5. Line 47: "found". This should be pointed out that the methods and results should be written in the past time. This mistake is done throughout the manuscript. Please check the manuscript for this (e.g., line 74 for "increased", line 75 for "had", line 77 for "described").
6. Line 66: What does "Older patients or comorbidities" mean? It was right the first time.

Other major considerations:

1. Please cite the sample size calculation formula. The reader should be able to replicate what was done. I was not able to replicate it as the information is deficient.
2. With small sample size, I can't actually see how the distribution for the continuous data like age would be conforming with normal distribution. Please see if the distribution is normal. If not, I recommend presenting the median and IQR as well.
3. Please also include in the limitations that this study has not accounted for the different COVID-19 variants.
4. The conclusion in lines 403-406 does not actually apply to the gap and aim of the study. In my opinion, it should be replaced with clinical recommendations or at least merged with it.

Reviewer #3: Authors did a great job in revising their manuscript. However there are certain grammatical and punctuation errors that needs to be addressed For example:

- Line 35: "reports the"
- Line 73: "- COVID-19 ", please remove the dash.
- Line 77: value - "values"
- Line 140: every symptom and sign- "every sign and symptom"
- Line 216: "Details"- "detailed". And many more.
- Authors needs to use active voice sentences and should extensively proofread the manuscript with respect to sentence formation, grammar as well as punctuations in order to make it more readable.
- Besides to make it impactfull, authors should specify and compare the symptoms of COVID-19 that occur in Bali vs symptoms that occurs at another place, was there any significant difference.

7. PLOS authors have the option to publish the peer review history of their article ([what does this mean?](#)). If published, this will include your full peer review and any attached files.

If you choose "no", your identity will remain anonymous but your review may still be made public.

Do you want your identity to be public for this peer review? For information about this choice, including consent withdrawal, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Reviewer #1: **Yes:** Van-Phu Tran

Reviewer #2: **Yes:** Abdelrahman M Makram

Reviewer #3: **Yes:** Zeeshan Ali Khan

[NOTE: If reviewer comments were submitted as an attachment file, they will be attached to this email and accessible via the submission site. Please log into your account, locate the manuscript record, and check for the action link "View Attachments". If this link does not appear, there are no attachment files.]

While revising your submission, please upload your figure files to the Preflight Analysis and Conversion Engine (PACE) digital diagnostic tool, <https://pacev2.apexcovantage.com/>. PACE helps ensure that figures meet PLOS requirements. To use PACE, you must first register as a user. Registration is free. Then, login and navigate to the UPLOAD tab, where you will find detailed instructions on how to use the tool. If you encounter any issues or have any questions when using PACE, please email PLOS at figures@plos.org. Please note that Supporting Information files do not need this step.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. ([Remove my information/details](#)). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Close

View Letter

Close

Date: Dec 09 2021 02:12PM
To: "Erni Juwita Nelwan" e.nelwan@gmail.com;nikodemushosea@yahoo.com
From: "PLOS ONE" plosone@plos.org
Subject: PLOS ONE Decision: Revision required [PONE-D-21-21595]
Attachment(s): [Review PONE-D-21-21595_ Tran Van Phu.docx](#)
[Cross-sectional \(1\).pdf](#)
[PONE Comments.docx](#)
[plagiarism Result.pdf](#)

PONE-D-21-21595
Clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 patients in Bali, Indonesia
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr. Nelwan,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to PLOS ONE. After careful consideration, we feel that it has merit but does not fully meet PLOS ONE's publication criteria as it currently stands. Therefore, we invite you to submit a revised version of the manuscript that addresses the points raised during the review process.

Please submit your revised manuscript by Jan 23 2022 11:59PM. If you will need more time than this to complete your revisions, please reply to this message or contact the journal office at plosone@plos.org. When you're ready to submit your revision, log on to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/pone/> and select the 'Submissions Needing Revision' folder to locate your manuscript file.

Please include the following items when submitting your revised manuscript:

- A rebuttal letter that responds to each point raised by the academic editor and reviewer(s). You should upload this letter as a separate file labeled 'Response to Reviewers'.
- A marked-up copy of your manuscript that highlights changes made to the original version. You should upload this as a separate file labeled 'Revised Manuscript with Track Changes'.
- An unmarked version of your revised paper without tracked changes. You should upload this as a separate file labeled 'Manuscript'.

If you would like to make changes to your financial disclosure, please include your updated statement in your cover letter. Guidelines for resubmitting your figure files are available below the reviewer comments at the end of this letter.

If applicable, we recommend that you deposit your laboratory protocols in protocols.io to enhance the reproducibility of your results. Protocols.io assigns your protocol its own Identifier (DOI) so that it can be cited independently in the future. For instructions see: <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/submission-guidelines#loc-laboratory-protocols>. Additionally, PLOS ONE offers an option for publishing peer-reviewed Lab Protocol articles, which describe protocols hosted on protocols.io. Read more information on sharing protocols at https://plos.org/protocols?utm_medium=editorial-email&utm_source=authorletters&utm_campaign=protocols.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,

Nguyen Tien Huy, Ph.D., M.D.
Academic Editor
PLOS ONE

Journal Requirements:

When submitting your revision, we need you to address these additional requirements.

1. Please ensure that your manuscript meets PLOS ONE's style requirements, including those for file naming. The PLOS ONE style templates can be found at
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/file?id=wjVg/PLOSOne_formatting_sample_main_body.pdf and
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/file?id=ba62/PLOSOne_formatting_sample_title_authors_affiliations.pdf

2. In your Data Availability statement, you have not specified where the minimal data set underlying the results described in your manuscript can be found. PLOS defines a study's minimal data set as the underlying data used to reach the conclusions drawn in the manuscript and any additional data required to replicate the reported study findings in their entirety. All PLOS journals require that the minimal data set be made fully available. For more information about our data policy, please see <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/data-availability>.

Upon re-submitting your revised manuscript, please upload your study's minimal underlying data set as either Supporting Information files or to a stable, public repository and include the relevant URLs, DOIs, or accession numbers within your revised cover letter. For a list of acceptable repositories, please see <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/data-availability#loc-recommended-repositories>. Any potentially identifying patient information must be fully anonymized.

Important: If there are ethical or legal restrictions to sharing your data publicly, please explain these restrictions in detail. Please see our guidelines for more information on what we consider unacceptable restrictions to publicly sharing data: <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/data-availability#loc-unacceptable-data-access-restrictions>. Note that it is not acceptable for the authors to be the sole named individuals responsible for ensuring data access.

We will update your Data Availability statement to reflect the information you provide in your cover letter.

3. PLOS requires an ORCID iD for the corresponding author in Editorial Manager on papers submitted after December 6th, 2016. Please ensure that you have an ORCID iD and that it is validated in Editorial Manager. To do this, go to 'Update my Information' (in the upper left-hand corner of the main menu), and click on the Fetch/Validate link next to the ORCID field. This will take you to the ORCID site and allow you to create a new iD or authenticate a pre-existing iD in Editorial Manager. Please see the following video for instructions on linking an ORCID iD to your Editorial Manager account:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_xcflvutxQ

4. We note that Figure 1 in your submission contain map images which may be copyrighted. All PLOS content is published under the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which means that the manuscript, images, and Supporting Information files will be freely available online, and any third party is permitted to access, download, copy, distribute, and use these materials in any way, even commercially, with proper attribution. For these reasons, we cannot publish previously copyrighted maps or satellite images created using proprietary data, such as Google Maps, Street View, and Earth). For more information, see our copyright guidelines: <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/licenses-and-copyright>.

We require you to either (1) present written permission from the copyright holder to publish these figures specifically under the CC BY 4.0 license, or (2) remove the figures from your submission:

a. You may seek permission from the original copyright holder of Figure 1 to publish the content specifically under the CC BY 4.0 license.

We recommend that you contact the original copyright holder with the Content Permission Form (<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/file?id=7c09/content-permission-form.pdf>) and the following text: "I request permission for the open-access journal PLOS ONE to publish XXX under the Creative Commons Attribution License (CCAL) CC BY 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Please be aware that this license allows unrestricted use and distribution, even commercially, by third parties. Please reply and provide explicit written permission to publish XXX under a CC BY license and complete the attached form."

Please upload the completed Content Permission Form or other proof of granted permissions as an "Other" file with your submission.

In the figure caption of the copyrighted figure, please include the following text: "Reprinted from [ref] under a CC BY license, with permission from [name of publisher], original copyright [original copyright year]."

b. If you are unable to obtain permission from the original copyright holder to publish these figures under the CC BY 4.0 license or if the copyright holder's requirements are incompatible with the CC BY 4.0 license, please either i) remove the figure or ii) supply a replacement figure that complies with the CC BY 4.0 license. Please check copyright information on all replacement figures and update the figure caption with source information. If applicable, please specify in the figure caption text when a figure is similar but not identical to the original image and is therefore for illustrative purposes only. The following resources for replacing copyrighted map figures may be helpful:

USGS National Map Viewer (public domain): <http://viewer.nationalmap.gov/viewer/>
The Gateway to Astronaut Photography of Earth (public domain): <http://eol.jsc.nasa.gov/sseop/clickmap/>
Maps at the CIA (public domain): <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/index.html> and
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/cia-maps-publications/index.html>
NASA Earth Observatory (public domain): <http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/>
Landsat: <http://landsat.visibleearth.nasa.gov/>
USGS EROS (Earth Resources Observatory and Science (EROS) Center) (public domain): <http://eros.usgs.gov/#>
Natural Earth (public domain): <http://www.naturalearthdata.com/>

5. We note you have included a table to which you do not refer in the text of your manuscript. Please ensure that you refer to Tables 6, 7 and 8 in your text: if accepted, production will need this reference to link the reader to the Table.

[Note: HTML markup is below. Please do not edit.]

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer's Responses to Questions

Comments to the Author

1. Is the manuscript technically sound, and do the data support the conclusions?

The manuscript must describe a technically sound piece of scientific research with data that supports the conclusions. Experiments must have been conducted rigorously, with appropriate controls, replication, and sample sizes. The conclusions must be drawn appropriately based on the data presented.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Partly

Reviewer #3: Partly

2. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: Yes

3. Have the authors made all data underlying the findings in their manuscript fully available?

The [PLOS Data policy](#) requires authors to make all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript fully available without restriction, with rare exception (please refer to the Data Availability Statement in the manuscript PDF file). The data should be provided as part of the manuscript or its supporting information, or deposited to a public repository. For example, in addition to summary statistics, the data points behind means, medians and variance measures should be available. If there are restrictions on publicly sharing data—e.g. participant privacy or use of data from a third party—those must be specified.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: Yes

4. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in standard English?

PLOS ONE does not copyedit accepted manuscripts, so the language in submitted articles must be clear, correct, and unambiguous. Any typographical or grammatical errors should be corrected at revision, so please note any specific errors here.

Reviewer #1: Yes

Reviewer #2: Yes

Reviewer #3: No

5. Review Comments to the Author

Please use the space provided to explain your answers to the questions above. You may also include additional comments for the author, including concerns about dual publication, research ethics, or publication ethics. (Please upload your review as an attachment if it exceeds 20,000 characters)

Reviewer #1: Firstly, the manuscript describes the deeper knowledge about clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 patients in Bali. The conclusion is interesting, it provides evidence to the physicians the diversity of clinical characteristics to detect the key signs and symptoms in COVID-19 patients as it compares COVID-19, non-COVID-19 patients and the control group. This manuscript has led the way to further studies in the future to investigate the coinfection between COVID-19 and dengue fever in Indonesia.

Overall, the study is well-conducted and the authors clearly explained the findings meticulously. The title is 10-word in length, which is good and well-addressed for the research aim.

MAJOR CONSIDERATION

1. The study population was not calculated.
2. Please note whether the outcome assessor is "blind". Sometimes the person measuring the exposure is the same person conducting the outcome assessment. In this case, the outcome assessor would most likely not be blinded to exposure status because they also took measurements of exposures. (Remove).
4. The authors should specifically mention how many healthy participants were in the control group, how did they define a healthy group? Were they tested with negative RT-PCR?
5. The study designs and patients (in the Methods section) is not well-organized, it should be divided into smaller sub-headings to make it more clear, such as study population, study settings, ethical consideration.
6. Demographic information should also be identified in detail. Which variables in demographic data and how are they measured?
7. Although the strengths and limitations of the study were mentioned in the manuscript, they should be written in separate sections.

MINOR CONSIDERATION

- Line 62: caused by -> which is caused by
- Line 63: [the] Middle
- Line 65: add "globally" -> have been reported globally.
- Line 71: spread -> spreads. and difficult to trace -> which is difficult to trace
- Line 72:
- + "illness" -> illnesses
- + "other disease" -> "another disease" or "other diseases"
- The authors need to write a full word for the first time it appears. CMV in line 73, RT-PCR in line 99
- Line 77: Bali -> COVID-19 pandemic
- Line 80: non-COVID patients -> non-COVID-19 patients
- Line 85: a cross sectional -> A cross-sectional
- Line 86: ...many hospitals and involving -> ...many hospitals, which involved
- Line 87: [the] Indonesian
- Line 94: [the] Ethical
- Line 99: according to the WHO criteria -> please insert a citation.
- Line 100: included -> categorized
- Line 110: remove "a" from "A mild illness", individual -> individuals
- Line 112: patient -> patients
- Line 113: individual -> individuals
- Line 114: a critical individual has -> critical individuals have
- Line 119: outcome -> outcomes. the authors should describe which sources parameters, comorbidities, and outcomes were collected.
- Line 130: Real-Time
- Line 137: negative RT-PCR with symptom -> negative RT-PCR with positive symptom
- Line 149: outcome -> outcomes
- Line 166: COVID-like -> COVID-19-like. Non-covid -> non-COVID-19
- Line 167: non-CoV -> non-COVID-19
- Line 188: covid-19 should be written in uppercase.
- Line 264: play -> plays
- Line 303: COVID-19 like illness -> COVID-19-like-illness. appeared the most -> appeared the most frequently
- Line 315: study -> studies
- Line 348: effort -> efforts
- Line 349: improve -> improving
- Line 108: This sentence should be rewritten by similarity with other documents.
- Source: Davici.biohub.solutions
- Line 139: This sentence should be rewritten by similarity with other documents.
- Source: www.kumj.com.np
- Many commas mistakes can be easily edited by using free proofreading software like Grammarly and Microsoft proofing tools.
- Recommendation: Minor revision

Reviewer #2: To begin with, this is an interesting article that describes the clinical course of COVID-19 in Bali, Indonesia. However, there are some major considerations that may hinder the publication of this article:

1. Although the journal does not put an emphasis on the novelty, this article does not have any implications on the current medical practice against COVID-19. The authors need to be more specific about their aim and how their findings will translate into the clinical practice.
2. The authors have not identified the gap in the literature that they intend to fill. For example, is there something that should be distinguished about COVID-19 in Bali that has not been evaluated in other places around the world? Do physicians in Bali follow other certain criteria for the diagnosis that need some revision?
3. The has been no sample size calculation prior to data collection.
4. The non-COVID-19 group had many diagnoses like "non-COVID-19 pneumonia, dengue hemorrhagic fever, and upper

respiratory tract infections". This should be further discussed in a table. The clinical features should also be compared. However, this only depends on the gap that the authors are willing to fill. In that case, the gap would be that the differentiation between different diseases that manifest like COVID-19 in Bali. But is that really a gap? Contrastingly, I consider this a flaw in the design that the authors have included non-healthy individuals in the non-COVID-19 group. 5. Having a mere association between LDH and ICU admission has already been established in the literature. It would be also hard for a cross-sectional study to study the prognostic value of LDH, although also discussed in the literature. So, there is also no value added to that kind of link between these two variables.

Some minor considerations:

1. Are there any clinical recommendations that can be added to the abstract?
2. Line 99: please cite the WHO criteria.
3. Line 107: the severity classification should be cited.
4. Line 248: Why is little known about the clinical features of COVID-19 in Indonesia? Are the authors speaking about a certain variant?
5. Consistently use COVID-19 instead of Covid-19.

Recommendation: Major Revision

Reviewer #3: Thank You for giving me a great opportunity to review this article.

I have reviewed this article with scrutiny. This cross sectional gives a good insight about Covid-19 in Bali Indonesia but there are certain major and minor aspects that authors need to take into consideration.

Major Considerations:

1. Abstract is composed of 725 words, according to Plos One author guidelines, the abstract should not exceed more than 300 words. Please review the author guidelines.
 2. The aim is not specific.(For example if it is specific for people of Bali or any specific symptom only prevalent in covid-19 strain of Bali).
 3. Are the authors talking about "alpha, beta, delta, delta plus or Mu". Please review the recent literature.
 4. Cross sectional study cannot infer temporality and it does not contain controls.
 5. Please determine the literature gaps.
 6. Eligibility criteria should be written in separate sub-heading.
 7. Sample size should be written in separate sub-heading
 8. Please write settings into a separate sub-heading, eg: the day of admission into the hospital because symptoms varies day to day.
 - The authors didn't described any efforts to address potential sources of bias.
 - a) Selection bias: In this study 19 imported cases out of 51(37%) which are not representative of Bali-Indonesia(selection bias).This does not match with the conclusion as it states that "The findings of this study could enrich the current knowledge about COVID-19 in particular in Indonesia with limited data."
 - b) Those who didn't gave consent they might have some variability in symptoms and the patients those are not hospitalized.
 9. 137-138 false negative and false positive definitions are wrong.
 10. Most important concept in severe COVID-19 is disseminated intravascular coagulation(DIC) one of the etiological factor of thrombocytopenia in Covid-19. Please refer to this article <https://eonline.biomedcentral.com/.../s40164-020-00172-4>. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1076029620987629>
 11. D-dimer assay is the most important blood parameter which defines severity of COVID-19, it is not mentioned. Please refer to this article <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33926262/> <https://www.frontiersin.org/.../10.../fpubh.2020.00432/full>
 - Lack of novelty or gap of knowledge
 - a) Disseminated intravascular coagulation is one the most serious complication of serious Covid-19. It should be considered in it.
 - b) D-dimer assay is the most important parameter to check the severity of Covid-19.
 - c) CMV pneumonitis(differentials) is quite rare, can add influenza, streptococcal pneumonia, etc.,
 - d) Headache is one of the most common symptoms of covid-19, it should be considered too <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33329305/>
- Minor Considerations:
1. The words Covid-19, non-Covid-19, non severe-Covid-19, severe covid-19 are used very harshly which creates confusion to readers. My suggestion is use it only in initial sentences and replace it with "patients", "disease", "mild-moderate disease", "severe disease", Normal individuals.
 2. In addition there are a lot of grammatical, punctuations, word selection mistakes. This could be corrected by using free proofreading tool like Grammarly.
 3. The tables in this article are Effective, Readable, Informative and Tidy. There are some minor considerations
 - a) Table:1 p-value for females is not given.
 - b) Table no. 6 and Table no. 8 comma is used in decimals instead of using point, (eg: sensitivity of fever is written as "45,19" rather than 45.19

Note: This paper can have a good impact on covid-19 literature, but authors need to review the recent literature and make necessary changes in order to make it exceptional, credible, enlightening and instructional paper for clinicians as well as researchers.

6. PLOS authors have the option to publish the peer review history of their article ([what does this mean?](#)). If published, this will include your full peer review and any attached files.

If you choose "no", your identity will remain anonymous but your review may still be made public.

Do you want your identity to be public for this peer review? For information about this choice, including consent withdrawal, please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

Reviewer #1: **Yes:** Tran Van Phu

Reviewer #2: **Yes:** Abdelrahman M Makram

Reviewer #3: **Yes:** ZEESHAN ALI KHAN

[NOTE: If reviewer comments were submitted as an attachment file, they will be attached to this email and accessible via the submission site. Please log into your account, locate the manuscript record, and check for the action link "View Attachments". If this link does not appear, there are no attachment files.]

While revising your submission, please upload your figure files to the Preflight Analysis and Conversion Engine (PACE) digital diagnostic tool, <https://pacev2.apexcovantage.com/>. PACE helps ensure that figures meet PLOS requirements. To use PACE, you must first register as a user. Registration is free. Then, login and navigate to the UPLOAD tab, where you will find detailed instructions on how to use the tool. If you encounter any issues or have any questions when using PACE, please email PLOS at figures@plos.org. Please note that Supporting Information files do not need this step.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. ([Remove my information/details](#)). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

Close