PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Experimental Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 76885

Title: Performance of a serological IgM and IgG qualitative test for COVID-19 diagnosis: An experimental study in Brazil

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05476667

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD, PsyD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Academic Research, Research Assistant, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-05 05:16

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-07 03:29

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection

Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: I have now reviewed your paper and recognize your manuscript. I recognize your manuscript addresses the interesting research question. the authors evaluated the effectiveness of rapid serological antibody tests in diagnosing COVID-19 pneumonia in patients who had radiological and clinical features compatible with COVID-19. However, I can suggest several weaknesses in the manuscript. I suggest revise title. The word performance does not seem to be accurate. Please, define that what is Qualitative antibody tests.   1. The critique and argument, which were too limited or not clarified thoroughly enough; 2.PLEASE, provide recommendations for practice and policy-making if sufficient, high quality evidence exists, or future directions for research. 3.Please, write the spelled out of abbreviation; at the first time in text appeared.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review's Comments The criteria checklist for new manuscript peer-review was used as the benchmark for assessing this manuscript. Overall, the manuscript was well written and would not hesitate to recommend it for publication. However, I have a minor question to ask: In line 119 is it sensitivity or sensibility? Kindly make the changes as well as a few typos.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Experimental Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 76885

Title: Performance of a serological IgM and IgG qualitative test for COVID-19 diagnosis: An experimental study in Brazil

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05476667

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD, PsyD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Academic Research, Research Assistant, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-05

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-12 20:20

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-12 20:27

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors   Thanks for efforts.