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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors have constructed a compelling hypothesis for the instigation of clinical diagnoses relating to stress- and infection-related psychiatric disease associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. This is a pertinent issue and warrants an editorial - indeed, one would hope that, as time passes, "long-COVID" will be replaced by more accurate diagnoses related to the psychiatric symptomology. Overall, the editorial is clear and well written. The authors could add a further paragraph which more specifically describes how the new diagnoses serve to benefit the individual - e.g. what might the implications be for treatment in Type A vs. Type B? I understand that these diagnoses are not mutually exclusive, though a dichotomy certainly would exist for example in younger vs. older individuals.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors have called this manuscript an editorial. It addresses an important topic e.g. the many medical and psychosocial aspects and components of COVID-19 and its aftermath, which is appropriate for an editorial. However, I think an editorial should be shorter and crisper. My recommendation would be that the authors turn this into a review paper and include a Method section (how they selected their studies, what questions they were asking) and a Table that clearly shows the various aspects they are discussing. That should not be difficult to do. The English is not perfect - it could benefit by a closed review by a native speaker.