

Dear Editor,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide the response to reviewers comments.

Reviewer #1 didn't have any comments.

The Reviewer #2 raised some issues and we have made the changes accordingly. Please find our response below.

1. The number of invalid samples at first attempt and detail what happen after repetition.

Details were added to Materials and Methods. The samples were retested and if they were negative were further subjected to confirmatory PCR testing. The explanation was added to the manuscript (Materials and Methods).

2. Were the RQ-PCR carried out using the same NP swab used for antigen test?

PCR was carried out from the same NP swab, which is also added to the manuscript (Materials and Methods)..

3. The asymptomatic number of patients grew-up during the study. Please specify the plausible reasons (samples were majorly collected in the pre-vaccine era).

The number of symptomatic persons was declining which was in accordance to the national epidemiological situation during the study period. During the study period the incidence and prevalence of COVID-19 was declining. This was added to Discussion.

4. How many operators were recruited according to the samples analyzed?

Since the number of samples was quite high during the first period of study we have recruited six operators to perform the RAT testing. Operators were competent and well-educated and therefore capable to perform high number of testing. Details added to the Discussion.

5. It is really important to polish the English language.

We have revised English language accordingly.

Best regards,

Anna Mrzljak