Reviewer #1:

1. I found the discussion of results to be very brief and did not discuss the conclusions or results from a fair few of the articles included in the review.

Authors' reply: Thanks for the comments. We couldn't get any specific message from the statement. However, we modified the manuscript in results, discussion, and conclusion section.

2. The observation that there is little empirical evidence around the management of panic buying is astute.

Authors' reply: We disagree with the reviewer's comment. We again firmly mention that we couldn't find any empirical evidence around the management of panic buying. We clearly mentioned the methods and results. We will be happy if reviewer can suggest any specific evidence from the selected studies.

3. The section that summarises the results of the literature talks about the geographical origins of the studies, their field, and their method, but I do not believe it is particularly educational.

Authors' reply: We disagree with the reviewer's comment. As an emerging research topic, this review would provide an important insight to stakeholders regarding the mentioned variables which ultimately helps to have further plans of study.

4. Perhaps a literature review would be more appropriate in a year when the literature is more developed. Since preprints were not included, it is possible that insightful research that is still on the cusp of publication has not been discussed here.

Authors' reply: We disagree with the reviewer's comment. As an emerging research topic, this review was intended to bring out an initial status research in the field. We also believe that exclusion of preprint is a strength of the review rather weakness.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting article about "panic buying" in the background of COVID-19. In order to improve the overall quality of the paper and its scientific impact, the authors should address the following aspects of concern:

1. The authors should report the systematic review methodology and results according to the PRISMA statement recommendations (https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/prisma/).

Authors' reply: Thanks for your comment. It is done and mentioned in figure 1.

2. There are parts of the text that need revision and improvements based on the language.

Authors' reply: Thanks for your suggestion. We edited the whole paper.

3. The inclusion and exclusion criteria were not clearly stated, like "other language", which language? "panic buying" definition not identified, so, what is the clear definition?

Authors' reply: Thanks for your comment. We elaborated the inclusion and exclusion criteria. However, we couldn't get the exact point by "'"panic buying" definition not identified, so, what is the clear definition?" We mentioned that panic buying was not studied as outcome variable and/or not mentioned. There is definitions of panic buying.