



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 76221

**Title:** Field evaluation of COVID-19 rapid antigen test: Are rapid antigen tests less reliable among the elderly?

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02521807

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Research Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Argentina

**Author's Country/Territory:** Croatia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-03-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-14 15:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-14 16:58

**Review time:** 1 Hour

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish            |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| <b>Conclusion</b>         | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| <b>Re-review</b>          | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Peer-reviewer<br/>statements</b> | Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No |
|-------------------------------------|---|

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The study from Tabain et al. evaluates the value of rapid antigen Test (Humasis Co., Ltd., Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea) in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection among symptomatic patients. The sample size is good but there several concerns to be assessed. Please, the authors should define: 1. The number of invalid samples at first attempt and detail what happen after repetition. 2. Were the RQ-PCR carried out using the same NP swab used for antigen test? 3. The asymptomatic number of patients grew-up during the study. Please specify the plausible reasons (samples were majorly collected in the pre-vaccine era) 4. How many operators were recruited according to the samples analyzed? it is really important to polish the English language.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 76221

**Title:** Field evaluation of COVID-19 rapid antigen test: Are rapid antigen tests less reliable among the elderly?

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05526790

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Author's Country/Territory:** Croatia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-03-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-16 09:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-16 09:47

**Review time:** 1 Hour

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish            |
| <b>Language quality</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| <b>Conclusion</b>         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| <b>Re-review</b>          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No   |



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Peer-reviewer<br/>statements</b> | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
|-------------------------------------|---|

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review the very good manuscript "Field evaluation of COVID-19 rapid antigen test: Are rapid antigen tests less reliable among the elderly?" by Tabain et al. It is written in an excellent and accessible way and addresses a relevant and highly topical issue. The finding that RATs perform better in younger patients than in older patients is very interesting and important in all areas where this test is to be used. I have no critical points that need to be addressed and wish the authors all the best.