

### **Reviewer Report and Authors' Responses**

Sr no	Reviewer Report	Response
1.	Consistent use of COVID-19. COVID-19 vs. COVID in some part of the manuscript	This was addressed and standardized throughout the text.
2.	Though writing is understandable, content-wise it is very verbose. Advised to make more succinct conclusions and remarks. While going thru the manuscript, there is the redundancy of some content and overlapping. Though very few notable languages and write-up errors, it is there in some areas eg. “.40 .” please revisit and proofread to omit such minor errors.	<p>The areas of overlapping content were addressed and deleted/revised accordingly.</p> <p>Minor syntax and grammatical errors were also corrected.</p> <p>The manuscript has been edited by an English-speaking native co-author.</p>
3.	Though this article is a narrative review, it is supposed to have clear methods, how it is carried out? I could not find any mention of search words, database searched, date of inclusion of published work, etc. Despite being a narrative review if authors could provide details of search findings, omission of duplicates, irrelevant papers, and papers reviewed in full text and those meeting criteria for inclusion, it would have been very clear (though PRISMA flow diagram is not required for narrative, a simple framework of study selection would have made methods more clear). Without such details, it is very difficult for replication. And replicability is a vital part of any research work. If proper heading eg. Methods, result, discussion is provided with a relevant subheading, I suppose it will be clearer and less verbose.	<p>Many thanks for the suggestion. We discussed the methodology in ‘literature search’ section. However, we are unable to use ‘result’ and ‘discussion’ sections as we need to analyze and organize the information under different subheadings to realize the aim of the review..</p>

4.	I got surprised to see, only a few studies were selected in a table included in the paper. What was the basis of selecting those ten papers? What about the quality of those papers? It is very vital to make these things clear to avoid selection bias of included paper and to avoid drawing bias conclusion being it is just a narrative review. Please kindly justify these and make it very clear to readers.	<p>Many thanks for the comment. We used these studies as an example to show the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on radiology education, training and practices. We didn't assess the quality of the studies as this not a systematic review. We have included the original studies which were published in peer-review journals and covered the medical students, student radiographers, trainee radiologists, residents, radiographers/radiologists, and member of the radiological societies from various countries.</p> <p>We have added three national surveys in the table.</p>
5.	The conclusion itself is very long nearly a page with 299 words. Please avoid the waste word and make it succinct and clear without any bias.	The conclusion was shortened significantly, with omission of unnecessary verbosity.
6.	<i>(1) Science editor:</i>	<b>Response</b>
7.	Scientific quality: This manuscript is a Review, and it does not reach the publication standard of the WJR. (1) Classification: Grade D;	N/A
8.	Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Reviewer 05471274 pointed out that Though writing is understandable, content-wise it is very verbose. Advised to make more succinct conclusions and remarks. While going thru the manuscript, there is	Some sections were shortened significantly and overlapping contents/redundancy were removed.

	the redundancy of some content and overlapping.	
<b>9.</b>	Language quality: Classification: Grade B. 3 Recommendation: Transferring to the World Journal of Meta-Analysis.	The manuscript has been edited by an English-speaking native co-author, so we hope it now matches the journal standard.
<b>10.</b>	<b><i>(2) Company editor-in-chief:</i></b>	
<b>11.</b>	I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Radiology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.	Thank you.