

Dear Editor in Chief Dr Lian-Sheng Ma,

Thank you for reconsidering our manuscript, which has been modified according to the suggestions proposed by the reviewer and the editor.

In the present rebuttal letter, we replied to the comments of the reviewer point by point.

We hope that our work could be acceptable for publication in *World Journal of Radiology* in the present form.

Dr.ssa Fabiana Perrone on the behalf of all the Coauthors

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes. 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? Yes. What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? An important systematic review was carried out in the recent literature on results of CT scan in cases of people affected by COVID-19, obtaining good outcomes that help to better understand the role of this radiological examination in the early diagnosis of the disease. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Yes. Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Yes. Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Yes. Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Enough. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes. 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Yes. Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare

the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes. **We thank the reviewer**

Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a systematic review of the radiological evolution of COVID-19 pneumonia at the computed tomography. The topic is within the scope of the WJR. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: An important systematic review was carried out in the recent literature on results of CT scan in cases of people affected by COVID-19, obtaining good outcomes that help to better understand the role of this radiological examination in the early diagnosis of the disease. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 2 tables and 1 figure; (4) References: A total of 53 references are cited, including 48 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJR. 5 Issues raised: (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; and (2) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text. 6 Re-Review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance. **We added article highlights, as required.**