

Reviewer #1:

R. It is an interesting manuscript. Authors succeed to present their data in a clear way adding information to the existing literature. Therefore, I have no corrections to do and the manuscript can be published unaltered.

A. Thank you for your appreciation of our work. We have tried to provide an overview of the main important aspects of the topic and to suggest further directions of experimental studies in this research area.

Reviewer #2:

R. [1) Several typos and grammatical errors were highlighted in the manuscript and should be corrected.

A. I'm sorry for these mistakes. We have corrected all the mentioned mistakes.

R. 2) Page 5, line 120-121, the ACE2 whole word has written for second time, as line 115.

A. Thank you for your suggestion. We have corrected that.

R. 3) The expression of COVID-19 should be written in unique format in the manuscript.

A. Thank you for your suggestion. We have corrected the expression of "COVID-19" in the whole manuscript.

R. 4) In some lines, the expression of et al should be written in similar format.]

A. Sorry for these omissions. We have adjusted the expression of *et al.* in the whole manuscript.

Reviewer #3:

R. General Remarks> -Firstly, is this manuscript a "narrative" or systematic" review type of article? This needs to be clearly stated as it determines how the manuscript will be generated and written for publication.

A. Sorry for this misunderstanding of our type of manuscript. Our review paper was designed as a narrative article, focusing on the paramount of this topic. We addressed

in an extensive way multiple potential research ideas, rather than doing a comprehensive systematic review.

R. -Authors are reminded of the following critical aspects when generating a review article for potential publication: 1) provide a comprehensive foundation on topic 2) explain current state of knowledge 3) identify gaps in knowledge, current research studies and potential for further research endeavors; 4) highlight main methodologies and research techniques; -I believe the first 3 aspects were addressed fairly well; however, the last aspect(#4) may have been weakly presented;

A. We will add a short paragraph addressing main methodologies and research techniques used in our review.

“This review aimed to provide an overview of the current knowledge about the involvement of gut microbiota in COVID-19 patients. We performed an electronic search in the databases of Medline (PubMed, PubMed Central) by using different terms combinations "COVID-19" or "Sars-Cov-2" and "microbiota", "airway microbiota", "Lung microbiota", "gut microbiota", "Dysbiosis", "Leaky Gut".”

R. -In addition, it is unclear as to what was precisely performed to generate this review manuscript regarding literature search and use of search engine along with search criteria; please confirm journal guidelines regarding this very important aspect; this point actually also depends on the type of review” which was performed (narrative vs systematic?).

-Please conform to the specific journal guidelines regarding aims and scope as well as citation numbering within the main text.

A. We stated clearly that our review is a narrative one, in Line 79 and Line 86.

R. -This review manuscript is overall fairly well written; it appears wordy and lengthy in some sections; however, the newly added sight adds to the current understanding of the topic of interest <Line by Line Suggestions>

Line 31: please clarify what you mean by “imaging” aspects?

A. By "imaging" aspects, we refer to various imaging data evaluated at different time-points of the clinical course and grades of severity in COVID-19 patients, which complicate disease management. With this, we want to outline the heterogenous clinical and imaging findings in COVID-19 disease.

R. Line 49: “form” unnecessary repetition of wording

A. Thank you for your comment. We deleted “form”.

R. Line 54: include “status” after ‘smoking;’ what is meant by “cytokine storm?” please clarify

A. We have followed your suggestions and also clarified the term “cytokine storm”.

R. Line 64: wording choice “evidenced” vs. ‘shown’ preferred

A. Thank you, we have corrected the mistake.

R. Line 77: [“...give us...”] --> prefer “provides”

A. Thank you, we have corrected it.

R. Line 79-82: the aim is stated clearly, however, the following transition sentence is awkward particular by the wording “furthermore...” and thus require re-wording and perhaps connection to yield a single sentence as opposed to two separate sentences;

A. We have removed the word "furthermore" and stated more clearly the aim of our review.

L80-85: “This narrative review aims to provide a new insight into the involvement of gut microbiota in COVID-19 patients by modulating inflammatory responses and disease severity. For a better understanding of the translational relevance of gut microbiota as disease modifying therapy in COVID-19 disease, we summarize the most common changes in gut composition abundance of commensal and pathogenic species in relation to disease onset and severity.

R. Lines 110-114: consider presenting this information as a ‘figure or table’ appropriately, as opposed to configured into the prose

A. thank you for your suggestion. We have configured this information into “table 1”.

We have adjusted the numbering of the rest of tables, as we have added a new table.

Table 1 Variants of concern (VOCs) reported so far in COVID-19 disease

VOCs	First time reported	Country of origin
Alpha (B.1.1.7)	December 2020	United Kingdom (UK)
Beta (B.1.351)	December 2020	South Africa
Gamma (P.1)	January 2021	Brazil
Delta (B.1.617.2)	December 2020	India

R. Line 496: [...currently 'conducted'...] --> prefer "in progress"

A. We have corrected the mistake.

R. Lines 505-507: the ending paragraph appears out of place; please modify the content and/or by inserting it into the previous paragraph of the conclusion Thank you for allowing me the privilege to review this work!

A. thank you for your suggestions. We have added the ending paragraph above.

L 507-510: The role of nutraceutical compounds, consisting of vitamins, dietary supplements, and pro/prebiotics in COVID-19, which have been reported to improve the clinical course and severity of COVID-19 disease, is suggested in Table 4.