

Answers to Reviewer Comments

Thank you for your constructive feedback about our manuscript. We revised our manuscript accordingly to address your comments as follows:

1. We added under Discussion the benefits and risks of the different management / treatment options for BK infection.
2. Ongoing research was mentioned in the different subheadings as applicable.
3. We added under Future Perspectives to include future directions.
4. We reviewed the PRISMA 2009 Checklist and applied the principles as applicable to the literature we reviewed.
5. We included literature published within the past 15 years to ensure that articles are up-to-date.
6. We mentioned about BK viral infection being a serious problem, not only in solid organ transplant recipients but also in hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients.

Specific Comments to Authors: The article titled " BK Viral Infection: A Review of Management and Treatment" explores current status and future perspectives of BK viral infection in hematopoietic stem cell transplant and solid organ transplant recipients, especially in kidney transplantation. This article provides valuable insights into the management of BK viral infection post-transplant. They are well-structured, comprehensive, and contribute to the existing literature. However, some issues are needed to address to enhance its impact. 1. This article highlights the clinical significance of the research in the context of the literature. However, readers could benefit from a more critical analysis of the effectiveness of different management strategies. Expanding the discussion of limitations and potential risks associated with each treatment modality would provide a more balanced view. 2. Lack of a section on ongoing research and future directions in the field of BK infection treatment. If included, it could be beneficial for readers. 3. Lack of key words and evidence-synthesis rationale such as PRISMA 2009 Checklist In summary, the article provides a valuable overview of current treatment options for BK viral infection in transplant recipients. It effectively discusses various modalities and cites relevant clinical trials and studies. To further improve the article, consider addressing the recommendations mentioned above. Additionally, ensuring that the article is up-to-date with the latest research findings will enhance its overall quality.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Overall, a very well written systematic review. BK virus infection is a much more serious problem, especially in bone marrow transplant patients. This situation can be briefly mentioned in the review.