

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 76816

Title: SARS-CoV-2 viral load in the upper respiratory tract and the disease severity in COVID-19 patients: a review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05631502

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Academic Research, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Qatar

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-22 07:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-24 10:14

Review time: 2 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<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>

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Peer review report I want to thank the authors for this work. I have reviewed it carefully and found the following issues that need to be addressed before the article can progress further. I only have one major concern and rest are all minor. My major concern is that when a research question has conflicting outcomes such as the one here (CT value correlation with COVID severity), the best method to present an answer is Meta-analysis of the pooled data. The authors have done an excellent exercise when it comes to literature review and presentation of crux of each study. However, the question remains unanswered even after publishing this general review. The only way to know is to conduct a metanalysis and judge the strength of each added study and provide a finalized opinion. If the authors have a record of all literature search process and was systematic, I highly suggest them to convert it to a metanalysis if the intention is to answer the research question of interest. - The title should ideally reflect the study design, I recommend adding word Review in the title. This is helpful for literature search by other authors. - Authors have presented results of multiple studies with the conclusions made by respective study authors. I believe that for a solid review, authors of the current review should give insights from their own mind also on each study as to how the results are significant and relatable to the current pandemic, what's the importance and clinical relevance of each study? - Formatting needs to be reviewed. After presentation of studies, there is a brief discussion. Wasn't the above information part of discussion? - Conclusion does not accurately justify the whole manuscript. As I recommended above, such a conclusion can be made with a metanalysis only instead of a general review.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 76816

Title: SARS-CoV-2 viral load in the upper respiratory tract and the disease severity in COVID-19 patients: a review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05385069

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Postdoctoral Fellow, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-07 19:57

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-07 20:00

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<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>

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This topic out of trend.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 76816

Title: SARS-CoV-2 viral load in the upper respiratory tract and the disease severity in COVID-19 patients: a review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05631502

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Academic Research, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Qatar

Author's Country/Territory: Thailand

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-24 09:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-24 12:18

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I don't think that the authors have addressed the queries raised by me. Specially the following point: Comment #3: Authors have presented results of multiple studies with the conclusions made by respective study authors. I believe that for a solid review, authors of the current review should give insights from their own mind also on each study as to how the results are significant and relatable to the current pandemic, what's the importance and clinical relevance of each study? - Formatting needs to be reviewed. After presentation of studies, there is a brief discussion. Wasn't the above information part of discussion? - Conclusion does not accurately justify the whole manuscript. As I recommended above, such a conclusion can be made with a meta-analysis only instead of a general review. Author answer: Thank you again for the valuable suggestion. If the reviewer noticed about the studies design of all the literatures which were reviewed, all of them are prospective cohorts and retrospective studies no a randomized control trial is found in the PubMed and other data bases. My query and the answer are not related at all.