Response to reviewers' questions

The resubmission of NO: 61198

We would again like to thank the editor and reviewer for your valuable time in carefully reading and reviewing of the manuscript. As suggested, we prepared a thorough revision that addresses in detail the concerns associated with the submitted manuscript.

Altogether, we carefully followed the suggestions of all reviewers, which certainly improved the manuscript. In what follows, we reproduce the reviewers' comments (in blue) and systematically address each of their concerns (in black).

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

Q1. Manuscript Title: Derivation and validation of a prediction rule for clinical diagnosis of severe COVID-19 Article Type: Original Manuscript ID: A cross-sectional study Similarity Index:? % Grammar: need revision Certificate of Biostatistics 61198-Institutional Review Board Approval Form or Document 61198-Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate 61198-Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s) BPG-Copyright-License-agreement-signed Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review

A1. Thank you for your positive feedback of our manuscripts. The manuscript

was edited by Medsci, an English editing service, and the English editing certification was uploaded in the system. All listed documents were uploaded, except for the "Criteria checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review". We are not sure what this document is, please let me know and we will provide and upload that later.

Q2. 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes, 3/5 the following title may be more attractive: The Clinical Diagnosis of Severe COVID-19; Validation of a Prediction Rule

A2. Thank you for providing the potential improvement of the title. We've updated the title in the text. Thanks!

Q3. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes, 4/5

A3. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q4. 3 Keywords. Do the keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript? No, 2/5; The keywords should be designed based on MESH. More specific words, according to the MESH and the study, should be applied. COVID-19 pandemic; Infectious diseases; scoring system; severity prediction; validation; Nomogram

A4. Thank you for pointing this out. We have updated the keywords based on MESH in the text.

Q5. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study? Yes, 4/5

A5. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q6. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes, 5/5

A6. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q7. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes, 4/5 The study strengthens the current criteria for the diagnosis of CVID19 severe infection

A7. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q8. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate, and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes. However, more discussion is needed. The discussion should present each find in a separate paragraph, comparing the result with other equivalent studies, and discuss the reasons for the similarities and differences. Some claims need

references. Line 265-266 Ministry of Health Guidelines[12], but different from the other practices in many other countries (References?). So far, mild and moderate patients with COVID-19 were encouraged to stay Line:275-276 As indicated by the research in China and Europe (References?)

A8. Thank you for pointing this out. We have updated the references in Discussion in the text according to your suggestions.

Q9. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality, and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks, etc., better legends? Yes 4/5

A9. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q10. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes, 5/5

A10. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q11. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of the use of SI units? Yes, 5/5

A11. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q12. 11 References. Does the manuscript cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections

appropriately? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite, and over-cite references? Yes, 4/5.

A12. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q13. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely, and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language, and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes, 4/5

A13. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q14. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes, 5/5

A14. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Q15. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents

that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes. The study approved by the local ethic committee.

A15. Thank you for positive response of our work.

Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of validated predictive rule for COVID-19. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The discussion accurate, and it discuss the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. However, more discussion is needed. The discussion should present each find in a separate paragraph, comparing the result with other equivalent studies, and discuss the reasons for the similarities and differences. Some claims need references; and (3) Format: There are 5 tables and 3 figures. A total of 33 references are cited, including 29 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by Medsci was provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Written Informed Consent and Institutional Review Board, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search.

5 Issues raised:

Q1. (1) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

A1. Thank you for letting us know. We've uploaded the funding approval document in the system.

Q2. (2) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

A2. Yes, we've put all figures in the PowerPoint, and upload the file in the system.

Q3. (3) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout;

A3. Thanks for pointing this out, we've updated the reference list thoroughly.

Q4. (4) I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text.

A4. Thanks for pointing this out, we've added the "article highlights" section accordingly.

6 Re-Review: Required.

7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Company editor-in-chief:

Q1. I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, 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. However, the quality of the English language of the manuscript does not meet the requirements of the journal. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240.

A1. Thanks for pointing this out, the manuscript was edited by Medsci, an English editing service, and the English Editing certificate was uploaded in the

system.

Round-2

The acronyms (e.g., NLR, P/F ratio) should be extended with the first occurrence in the abstract and the main text separately.

A. The acronyms (e.g., NLR, P/F ratio) have been extended with the first occurrence in the abstract and the main text separately.