

Answers to Editor,

First of all, we would like to express our respect to the Editorial team and the referees and thank them for their help in the scientific development of the article. We respect the Editor-in-Chief's suggestion to change the journal. We have drawn a high-quality figure on NHE and its overstimulation mechanism. We added new references according to reviewer 1 and Editor's recommendations as using RCA analysis.

Answers to Reviewer 1,

We disagree with the idea that the scientific value of the article is fair (Grade D). Einstein's theory of relativity has not been scientifically proven yet, nor has it been disproved. Scientists had presented evidence (Grade A = excellent) for a long time that OCSs were safe. Many patients were harmed in this process. Then the evidence changed. It is still unknown whether many drugs are beneficial or harmful in the COVID-19 treatment. Various evidence is presented today for corticosteroids and vitamin D, which were presented as very useful yesterday for COVID-19 treatment. Our theory is based on solid evidence. Even if it is wrong, it will help scientists find the truth. Eventually, while we respect the referee's opinion, we disagree with his/her opinion.

*The English language of the article was revised again by an expert, and the expert made several minor changes to the manuscript. Changes that affect meaning are marked in yellow.

*Changed references for lines 12-13.

*In lines 17-24 of page 4 and 1-6 of page 5. A prospective study for bilirubin was given as a reference. In addition, a multicenter and large population retrospective study by strobe rules was

added as a reference. Added reference on the relationship of D-dimer, fibrinogen, and thrombosis to liver damage and COVID-19.

*In lines 20-21 of page 6. It has been reported in many publications in the literature that simultaneous NHE and reverse NCE activation leads to Na^+ and Ca^{2+} overload.

*In line 11 on page 7. The sentence has been corrected.

*In lines 23-24 of page 7, 1-2 of page 8, 6-11 of page 8. As the referee said, here we can provide indirect evidence. Because this subject is very new and there is no relevant study in the literature yet.

*In lines 1-2 of page 10. The referee is right about this. In our literature review, we found a congress abstract as a source on this subject in the Circulation journal (High impact journal) and added it as a reference.

*In lines 7-8 of page 10. there is no relevant study in the literature yet.

*As mentioned above, we have added a reference for this topic.

Answers to Reviewer 2, We cannot give a statistical result in the article. It's still a very new subject.

There are not enough studies on this subject in the literature.

Answers to Reviewer 3, The article has been corrected according to the referee's suggestions.