

## ROUND 1

Dear Editor,

We would like to resubmit the revised manuscript entitled "**Timing of convalescent plasma therapy: tips from a case report of curing a 100-year old COVID-19 patient using convalescent plasma treatment**" for consideration by *World Journal of Clinical Cases*. We would like to thank the reviewers for thoroughly reviewing our manuscript and making many thoughtful comments. We were very pleased to see that all reviewers recognized the novelty and potential significance of our work. We have added significant new data, described in detail below, and revised the manuscript to address reviewers' comments. Here are our point-by-point responses:

### Reviewer 1

1. The quality of the English is variable and is below the standard for a scientific journal. There are numerous grammatical errors, in particular in the abstract, introduction, and conclusion. These include the title (100 years old),; "But the best timing application of plasma therapy and whether effect clinical result by antiviral and antibiotic treatment is not clearly." (last sentence of background section of the abstract is incomplete); "a male 100 years" (first sentence of Case Summary section of abstract; "the elderly is the high-risk" (fourth line of Introduction; etc. I would suggest that the entire manuscript be reviewed for similar errors.

Respond: thanks for the comments. We proofread the manuscript again and did some revisions.

2. A large section of the manuscript and the supporting documents classes of COVID-19 patients? Given that the microbiome of such patients does not appear to be a focus of the manuscript, is it really worthwhile to add such detail without clinical context?

Respond: thanks for the comments. We thought it might be more scientific and convincing with the supporting documents.

3. I find it difficult to understand this sentence in the conclusion of the abstract (which also occurs in modified form elsewhere in the manuscript: "This choice of time points provides a reference for choosing the best timing of convalescent plasma treatment and highlights the effectiveness of the clinical strategy of plasma treatment in the recovery period of patients with COVID-19 pneumonia." On the basis on one patient do the authors state that days 7 and 11 are the optimal days for convalescent plasma administration? This is not clear from the reading of the text.

Respond: thanks for the comments. We revised it a little and described it as a limitation..

4. The manuscript is overly long, including the conclusion, which is largely a verbatim repetition of the introduction.

Respond: thanks for the comments. We shortened it as required.

5. There appear to be several papers in the published literature that discuss timing of convalescent plasma therapy (including knowledge gaps in this area). The manuscript should comment on at least some of these.

Respond: thanks for the comments. We described it in the discussion part.

#### Reviewer 2

-Chief complaints and History of present illness, they can be condensed in one paragraph - In Table 1, delete the days without laboratory results and keep only days 5, 9, 10, 12 and 13 as reported in the text.

Respond: thanks for the comments. We condensed the content, and we thought it is necessary to keep these because if deleted it looks incomplete.

-Improve English language -In Discussion, cycle threshold (Ct) is low in the presence of high viral load because virus detection occurs early in the amplification process; it is high in the presence of low viral load. Please, revise

the sentence: the cycle threshold values were significantly lower than those on the 5th day of hospitalization.

Respond: thanks for the comments. We corrected it.

-A statement about the approval of the study by the Etichs Committee must be reported in the text of the manuscript.

Respond: thanks for the comments. We stated it in the beginning of the manuscript.

## ROUND 2

There are still some errors that require your attention: Correct "an newly"; "breathe";  
"2019 influenza A"

Done