

ROUND 1

Response to Reviewer1 Comments

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your time and effort spend reviewing our manuscript. In the following, we will try to give an eloquent answer to your observations.

Point 1: There is literature highlighting the importance of patients to undergo chest CT scan for early detection of COVID-19, particularly if asymptomatic. We have known in fact that PCR might not result positive in the early phases of the disease or because of other variants, so it is worth to discuss the following

<https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7768383>

Answer 1: Thank you for the good observation. Additional information and reference added to paragraph 4 of the discussion “PCR may be negative in the early stages of the disease and due to other variants, as well as the RT-PCR tests inadequacy contributes to the overuse of Thorax CT (17,18).”.

Point 2: Could the authors show some images that relate to the different age groups and confirm the findings?

Answer 2: Thank you for the observation. CT images of different age groups have been added (figure 4,5,6,7,8).

Point 3: Were the comorbidities influencing irrespectively of age the outcomes? In other words, did the authors perform a multivariate analysis adjusting for comorbidities?

Answer 3: Although we agree that working with comorbid data would be of higher quality, data related to comorbidity were not collected because our study was planned for radiological imaging and findings.

We wish to warmly thank you for your expert, thoughtful, and very pertinent observations, which made us realize omissions we made and, we estimate, greatly helped us improve the paper.

With gratitude.

Erdal Karavas

Response to Reviewer2 Comments

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your time and effort spend reviewing our manuscript. In the following, we will try to give an eloquent answer to your observations.

Point 1: In the MATERIALS AND METHODS section, subtitle should be added, such as Statistical analysis. Additionally, in the Statistical analysis section, should “A P value of less than 0.05 considered as statistically significant” be added?

Answer 1: Thank you for the very good observation. “P value of less than 0.05 considered as statistically significant” added to Materials and Methods section.

Point 2: In the first sentence of results section, “with 6 %of 241 (58.8%) males and 170 (%41.4) %females” should be changed to “with 241 (58.8%) males and 170 (41.4%) females”. In the other sentence of results section, “a positive rate of 77.9 %(41/181)” should be changed to “a positive rate of 77.9 %(141/181)”. Additionally, according to the result of figure 1, the percent of the age group 3 in the figure 2 should be 33.3%, not 33.1%. Please check these results carefully.

Answer 2: Thank you for the observation. Please accept our apologies for any inadvertent typos; the necessary corrections have been made.

Point 3: Were the comorbidities influencing irrespectively of age the outcomes? In other words, did the authors perform a multivariate analysis adjusting for comorbidities?

Answer 3: Although we agree that working with comorbid data would be of higher quality, data related to comorbidity were not collected because our study was planned for radiological imaging and findings.

Point 4: Please refer to recent papers published in World Journal of Virology and correct the format, such as: “Core Tip” and “ARTICLEHIGHLIGHTS” should be added. Other suggestiones have been listed in the uploaded revised version.

Answer 4: Thank you for the good observation “Core Tip” and “Articlehighlights” was added. Other suggestions found in the revised version have been edited.

Point 5: In references, all journal names should be italic, volume number should be bold, issues should be deleted, PMID number and DOI should be provided. Please check all references including content and format carefully according to the journal’s requirements.

Answer 5: Thank you for the reminder. All references have been edited

We wish to warmly thank you for your expert, thoughtful, and very pertinent observations, which made us realize omissions we made and, we estimate, greatly helped us improve the paper.

With gratitude.

Erdal Karavas

ROUND 2

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your time and effort spend reviewing our manuscript. In the following, we will try to give an eloquent answer to your observations.

Point 1: Please refer to recent papers published in World Journal of Virology and correct the format. In Author contributions section, “KARAVAŞ” should be changed to “Karavaş”. Other places should be modified accordingly. In BACKGROUND section. “COVID-19” should be changed to “Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)”. In “RESULTS” section, “Real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)” should be changed to “RT-PCR” because it’s mentioned for the second time.

Answer 1: Thank you for the good observation. The authors' surnames were modified in the author contributions. section.

In background section. “COVID-19” was changed to “Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)”.

In results section, “Real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)” was changed to “RT-PCR”.

Point 2: In page 7, “141/181?” should be changed to “141/181”.

Answer 2: Thank you for the observation. Please accept our apologies for any inadvertent typos; the necessary corrections have been made.

Point 3: In Figure 4, “Figure 4: A 5-year-old female patient undergoes a thoracic CT scan.” should be changed to “Figure 4 A thoracic CT scan in a 5-year-old female patient”. Additionally, “CT” should be provided the full name. Other places should be modified accordingly.

Answer 3: Figure 4 was changed to “A thoracic computerized tomography (CT) scan in a 5-year-old female patient.”.

Point 4: In table 2, “Table 2.The diagnostic accuracy of findings across the entire population” should be changed to “Table 2 The diagnostic accuracy of findings across the entire population”, and should be bold. Other places should be modified accordingly.

Answer 4: Thank you for the observation. In table 2 was changed to “The diagnostic accuracy of findings across the entire population” and table headings have been modified to bold.

Point 5: In reference 2, cited date should be provided. Other places should be modified accordingly. Other suggestions have been listed in the uploaded revised version.

Answer 5: Thank you for the observation. Cited date was provided In reference 2 and 6.

We wish to warmly thank you for your expert, thoughtful, and very pertinent observations, which made us

realize omissions we made and, we estimate, greatly helped us improve the paper.

With gratitude.

Erdal Karavas