Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Title: Clinical outcomes of the omicron variant compared with previous SARS-CoV-2 variants; meta-analysis of current reports The meta-analysis piqued my interest, so I read it carefully. The authors did a fantastic job, and they performed a clearer meta-analysis on recent findings that compare the clinical outcomes of the omicron variant to previous SARS-CoV-2 variants. Authors, thank you for taking the time to write such a thorough review of this intriguing title; nevertheless, please address the following points:

- Δ69–70…. make symbol Δ clearer for reader, what it represents.

Response: this variation occurred in the Spike protein of Omicron variant that causes false-negative PCR using conventional commercial diagnosis kit for SARS-CoV-2 infection, it was revised.

- The sentence… "According to animal models investigations, the severity of symptoms, viral load was less severe in the omicron variant compared with previous reported SARS-CoV-2 variants" …. check for clarity.

Response: The sentence was clarified.

- In the sentence…" Data were polled using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA) software version 2.2 (Biostat, Englewood, NJ, USA)." …it seems author desired to say pooled instead of polled.

Response: The sentence was clarified.

- Similarly, …." We polled the data on 887,132…………

Response: The sentence was clarified.

- Are there only 13 studies identified for the analysis on this two viruses?

Response: our right, we performed a comprehensive literature search in major electronically international databases by February 2022; there was only 12 studies that met our criteria. However, the results of our analysis has been confirmed with previous as well as current reports.

- Citing figures and tables in the text is recommended.

Response: All figures and table were cited in the text.

- Double check for possible word redundancy, typos and grammatical errors.

Response: It was corrected.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Scientifically, it is a good article. However, an important correction should be made in the English language of the article.

Response: English editing was done.