

Dear Editor,

Please find below the point by point answers of the reviewers' comments.

Reviewer #1: The authors come up with an interesting perspective with a focus on "recontamination" taking the sidelines of reinfection after vaccinations. I have made subtle comments and edits in the manuscript.

- Thank you for the corrections. All of them are just and we maintained them highlighted in red as well as the other modifications.

Generally the MS is written well, but has not so good citations A pictorial perspective will be nice taking a coalesce of the three Rs

- We were not sure which randomised studies you ment. We chose the registration trials of BNT162b2, mRNA-1273 and Ad26.COV2.S vaccines and inserted them in the introduction.

The conclusions must be elaborative

- The conclusions part was completely reformulated. We hope you are going to find the new version more appropriate.

What is the inherent advantage of herd immunity may be described

- Although herd immunity is a frequently used term in media discussions we do not know any exact definition of it. Therefore we preferred not to treat this issue in the article.

Reviewer #2: Well written manuscript.

- Thank you for supporting our work.

Science editor:

This paper gives a short overview of the most recent data on the rate of reinfection of vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals. The author puts forward the viewpoint of reinfection and recontamination, and the research is interesting and novel. But the related ethics and relevant documents are needed.

- This manuscript is a mini-review. We do not understand what kind of ethics document do you mean. The copyright licence is going to be uploaded with the revised manuscript.

Company editor-in-chief:

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 Methodology, 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. Please be sure to use Reference Citation Analysis (RCA) when revising the manuscript. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. For details on the RCA, please visit the following web site: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>. 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.

- We visited the proposed web site. Unfortunately we could not find out how to build the tables. Anyway, we hope that the formulation of the references corresponds to the Journal's requirements. By the way in our earlier cooperations with other journals the reference list was always found to be convenient.

We hope you are going to accept the required modifications.

Yours sincerely

Kullmann Tamás