



SDI EDITORIAL COM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. The authors did not show the approved letter from Ethics Committee.</p> <p>2. The study 1 and 2 are retrospective and the study 3 is experimental. It is mandatory the approval for ethics committee. The authors said that ethics committee were they.</p> <p>3. Also, the authors mention three studies in one. Why they write a systematic review.</p> <p>4. I cannot find a logic methodology and design of the study..</p> <p>5. The authors should follow the guidelines to publish a research.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in our paper.</p> <p>1. We added the Approval letter in annex in the manuscript highlighted in yellow.</p> <p>2. We have had the approval for ethics committee (see letter in Annex). In France, in a context of pandemic and emergency, it has been authorized for authors to participate in ethics committees giving approval; this is the case here of Professor Hantome of the University of Melon.</p> <p>3. In fact, it is mostly a large study (Study 3), preceded by epidemiological justification from Studies 1 and 2. This type of presentation is very fashionable in France, in order to avoid the race for publication, by making so-called narrow papers. We didn't have the material for a systematic review, but it's a project.</p> <p>4. We clarified the 4 parts: introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion. There are obviously some limitations to our work, which have been added as a result of the reviewers' pertinent remarks.</p> <p>5. We clarified the 4 parts, as mentioned.</p> <p>Thank you for your remarks which allow us to greatly improve the quality of our article.</p>