Response to reviewers:

We would like to thank the editor and reviewers for their comments and suggestions. We have incorporated all your comments and the explanations are as detailed below.

<u>Editorial comment:</u>

Comment 1:

Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022.

Our response: All the figures are original, and we have now included a .ppt version of the same, citing a copyright text at the bottom.

Comment 2:

Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

Our response: All the tables have now been formatted to include only top, bottom and column lines.

Comment 3:
Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision.

Our response: We have used the RCA tool to screen additional studies and have now included a few of the studies identified using this tool.

Reviewer's comments:

Reviewer 1

Comment 1:
Cardiac bioenzymes act as surrogate markers for various cardiovascular complications associated with COVID-19. Cardiac bioenzymes at admission and their serial monitoring can help assess the disease severity and predict mortality in patients with COVID-19. This review summarizes the role of these bioenzymes in diagnosis, prognosis and clinical implications on outcomes of various cardiovascular complications associated with COVID-19. Regarding methodology, it is suggested to follow PRISMA strategy regarding systematic reviews.

Our response: Thank you for mentioning this important aspect. We have now added a figure 1 which follows PRISMA guidelines to highlight the screening and literature search.

Comment 2:
It is mentioned: "As of March 2022, a total of 510 papers were identified. Among them, only 58 papers were eligible to be included. Two independent trained physician reviewers were involved in screening and reviewing

relevant articles" - Which were the criteria of inclusion or exclusion an article?

Our response: The inclusion and exclusion criteria have been mentioned in the methods section, page 8.

Comment 3:
Discussion is a missing part of the article: Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently?

Our response: Thank you, we have now added a discussion section, pages 23 and 24.

Reviewer 2

Comment 1:
Manuscript entitled "Utility of Cardiac bioenzymes in predicting cardiovascular outcomes in SARS-CoV-2" is a comprehensive review on the various cardiac biomarkers that have gained importance in the context of COVID-19 and how they may be assessed to understand the the prognosis of COVID patients. The merit of this review is extensive literature search and lucid review of the important biomarkers. However certain edits would help to enhance the quality of the manuscript. While each biomarker has been dealt with sufficient information, details are missing. For example, where a specific biomarker is seen to be elevated in most patients showing poor prognosis, mentioning the exact range of the elevated level would help. Physiological ranges of the additional biomarkers and their COVID-related levels also may be mentioned.

Our response: Thank you for this great suggestion. We have now included the range of these biomarker elevations individually for troponin (pages

10,11), natriuretic peptides (pages 15,16), novel biomarkers (pages 18,20 and 22).

Comment 2:
Fig 1 has no label to the X-axis and is difficult to ascertain the message being communicated.

Our response: Thank you, the figure has been edited with labels on axes.