

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript. All the reviewer comments have proven useful in rewriting this paper. The revisions are based on the reviewers' comments, and we have responded to them point-by-point. We hope that these changes have improved the paper and that the paper can be considered for publication in your journal. Our responses are in RED color in this text.

Sincerely,

In the abstract each acronym should be explained. In this form the manuscript dose not appear as a review but as an editorial.

We explained the each acronym in the abstract. We changed the manuscript type.

Although it is an interesting point of view, this article is an editorial and not a review. I would recommed to be rejected and I would suggest the authors to submit it again as an editorial. It needs some language polishing, tough.

We changed the manuscript type. We have edited the manuscript a professional editing service and we provide the certificate of the editing in the submission files.

Although the subject is topical and the reading of this paper is interesting, it does not fit into any form of the review article. This short paper explains few novel information about CMV but does not provide information or suggestion about future direction. I strongly suggest including addition sentences about future direction in the conclusion.

We added the sentences(below) to the conclusion part according to the reviewer suggestion.

In conclusion, researchers should focus the novel basic scientific data about the host and CMV interaction and re-review the clinical and pathological definitions of CMV related diseases and treatment effectiveness of antivirals in the light of the evolutionary perspective.