

Dear editor of World Journal of Clinical Cases

Thank you for your e mail

We would like to present our thanks for considering our work for publication

We would like to thank the reviewers for their insightful comments

Attached is the response to the reviewers' comments

We hope it will meet your approval

Reviewer#1:

Specific Comments to Authors: Overall, the Letter to Editor is informative and well written, and easy to understand, but there are some minor grammatical mistakes that need to remove. I would suggest this letter be published in your Journal

Response :thank you sir for your kind words ;the text has been proofread

Reviewer#2:

Specific Comments to Authors: Please find the comments on the manuscript. If these questions are not fixed I recommend the paper to not be published.

Response

Thank you, sir, for your insightful comment; it really adds a great impact to our work and improved its quality

Kindly check the changes we have made in the abstract; core points and in the text and the new references we added. We hope they will meet your approval. All were highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer#3:

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. In the "Abstract" section, the authors claimed that the disease is more likely to run a less aggressive course than another variant. However, a certain proportion of the elderly population and child still have severe symptoms. This description should be more conserved.

Thank you sir for highlighting this point ;the abstract was revised as advised .

2. Patients had more thickening of the bronchial walls, but the disease was less severe and they had better hospital outcomes than with earlier versions. Please specify what are the hospital outcomes?

Dear reviewer; the missing knowledge was added. thank you for the highlight.

3. It is worth mentioning that the vaccine is not licensed for children under four. Is it correct for the current status?

True sir ;we have updated the information and added a new content and reference ;it was excellent note; thank you.

4. Although a broad protective vaccination is urgently needed and effectively improve the individual immunity against SARS-CoV-2, the potential effects of other self-protective strategies such as wearing mask and keep safe social distancing cannot be omitted.

We totally agree; we add that knowledge into the end of the abstract and the end of conclusion; thank for the suggestion.

Reviewer#4:

Specific Comments to Authors: this is a letter to editor. there is a common knowledge for omicron in this letter, "Omicron infectivity and spread are much higher than an earlier variant. However, it caused a less aggressive course, lower inflammatory biomarkers, and less radiological evidence of lung injury. High-risk groups for having severe forms of the infection were children under four, the elderly, and the unvaccinated population, which reinforces the importance of the vaccine in breaking the disease chain." what is the original findings or idea in this manuscript? or What are the new phenomena that results from the reviews of the authors? what do the authors expect to tell the new information?

Dear reviewers, thank you for bringing these points; thanks to the important comments that the reviewers have made and the issues that you kindly pointed to we have added a new contents and conclusion at the final 10 lines of the letter.

We hope the new changes we have made will meet your approval.