

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jlpm-23-35>

Reviewer Comments

Reviewer A

Comment 1: This manuscript refers to the comparison between vitamin D levels in patients in the pre-pandemic period (PP) and during the pandemic, focusing on age and gender. However, for the assessment of vitamin D status, more patient characteristics need to be taken into consideration such as the seasonal variations, skin phototype, and BMI as well as the consumption of vitamin D or multivitamin supplements.

Reply 1: Thank you for the comment. We agree that clinical features would be very important to better understand the effect of social distancing on VitD levels. However, the data were obtained from a database of outpatients who performed the VitD dosage for checkup purposes. The laboratory that performed the tests is not located in a hospital, and the clinical characteristics of the population are not available. In addition, it is not feasible to search for this information at this time, since more than 300,000 results were included.

Changes in the text: Not applied.

Reviewer B

Comment 1: I think the report needs revision in terms of language and terminology.

Reply 1: Thank you for the comment.

Changes in the text: See the overall changes according to your file attached.

Comment 2: The authors refer only to social distancing, and then again to other public health measures, such as home confinement, quarantine, or lockdown.

Therefore, I suggest using a more general term, and explaining what is included (see commented document)

Reply 2: Thank you for the suggestion. We revised the term according to your suggestion.

Changes in the text: Lines 36 (p. 2), 74 and 82 (p. 3), 138 (p. 5), 179 (p. 6)

Comment 3: I think the conclusion that the authors have drawn needs rewriting
- contradictory results on the topic of vitamin D supplementation in COVID-19 patients, more likely that there is no benefit for those patients.

- From the results presented, it is most likely that the pandemic, especially the public health measures, had an influence on the general population's vitamin D level. (Please see comments in the attached document)

Reply 3: Thank you for the suggestions. We revised the conclusion.

Changes in the text: Lines 166 and 177 (p. 6)

Reviewer C

Comment 1: Please describe the reference values about vitamin D deficiency, and

discuss how the results of this study to compared with the values.

Reply 1: Thank you for the important suggestion. The information was included.

Changes in the text: Line 118 (p. 4)

Comment 2: Is there any data about the meal which the study subjects had?

Reply 2: Unfortunately, this data is not available. The data were obtained from a database of outpatients who performed the VitD dosage for checkup purposes. The laboratory that performed the tests is not located in a hospital, and the clinical characteristics of the population are not available.

Changes in the text: Not applied.

Comment 3: Although the differences about 25(OH)D levels by gender or age are described, the contents of the discussion are insufficient. Please cite previous reports more and discuss about the results of this study with the reports.

Reply 3: Thank you for the suggestions. We included new discussion and two references.

Changes in the text: Line 143 (p. 5)