

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 76221

Title: Field evaluation of COVID-19 rapid antigen test: Are rapid antigen tests less reliable among the elderly?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02521807

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Argentina

Author's Country/Territory: Croatia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-14 15:38

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-14 16:58

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

The study from Tabain et al. evaluates the value of rapid antigen Test (Humasis Co., Ltd., Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea) in the diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection among symptomatic patients. The sample size is good but there several concerns to be assessed. Please, the authors should define: 1. The number of invalid samples at first attempt and detail what happen after repetition. 2. Were the RQ-PCR carried out using the same NP swab used for antigen test? 3. The asymptomatic number of patients grew-up during the study. Please speciffy the plausible reasons (samples were majorly collected in the pre-vaccine era) 4. How many operators were recruited according to the samples analyzed? it is really important to polish the English language.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 76221

Title: Field evaluation of COVID-19 rapid antigen test: Are rapid antigen tests less reliable among the elderly?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05526790

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: Croatia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-16 09:35

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-16 09:47

Review time: 1 Hour

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

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review the very good manuscript "Field evaluation of COVID-19 rapid antigen test: Are rapid antigen tests less reliable among the elderly?" by Tabain et al. It is written in an excellent and accessible way and addresses a relevant and highly topical issue. The finding that RATs perform better in younger patients than in older patients is very interesting and important in all areas where this test is to be used. I have no critical points that need to be addressed and wish the authors all the best.