Reply to the Science Editor

Thank you for your thoughtful remarks and instructions which we revised the manuscript in accordance to.

(1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor

The figure was prepared and provided in PowerPoint format as required.

(2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout

The PMID and DOI numbers were provided to all references and all authors were listed.

(3) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

The Article Highlights section was added at the end of the main text.

Reply to the reviewers

Thank you for the thoughtful review of our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to the reviewer's remarks and would like to respond to their comments as follows

A Systematic Review of the Predictors of Severe and Critical COVID-19, by Emile et al., 2020. This is a systematic review of the predictors of COVID-19. After having searched in 3 databases, authors retrieved 541 articles, but only 5 articles were retained for the review. The study has adhered to the methodology of PRISMA and assessed the quality of articles through MINORS. This article contributes to the quantitative view of potential predictors of worse outcome among those patients infected with COVID-19. All 5 retained studies have come from China, but the non-overlap of the samples' participants should be stated.

Thank you for the favorable appraisal of our manuscript. We stated in the manuscript that no overlap of the samples' participants was noted.

Minor points: There are more limitations of study execution and article selection that preclude more solid interpretations.

We added the limitations of study execution and article selection and omitted any solid interpretations.

Please fix the Zhou et al., 2002 by 2020 in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

The reference by Zhou et al was fixed in the tables.