OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:

Peer Review

Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jkums-119539
Published in: Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences: 26(1) ; e119539

Peer Review Report for "A Meta-Analysis on The Comparison of The Sensitivity of Three Test Methods Used in the Diagnosis of COVID-19"

Author(s): Elmas Pinar Kahraman Kilbas, Imdat Kilbas, Ihsan Hakki Ciftci

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	14 Sep 2021
Revised Date:	18 Jan 2022
Accepted Date:	29 Jan 2022

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Aalireza Khatoony : Reviewer — 20 Sep 2021

No

Milad Jalilian : Reviewer — 29 Nov 2021

Title:
A Meta-Analysis on The Comparison of The Sensitivity of Three Different Test Methods Used in The Diagnosis of COVID-19
Dear Editor;
Thank you for choosing me as reviewer. Based on the title and comments I recommend this article for major revision.

Title:
A Meta-Analysis on The Comparison of The Sensitivity of Three Different Test Methods Used in The Diagnosis of COVID-19
Dear Editor;
Thank you for choosing me as reviewer. Based on the title and comments I recommend this article for major revision.

Title:
1- There is no need to “Different” word. Just three tests used ... .
Abstract
2- objective: there is no reason for this revie. Please explain about the importance of the title
3- Please use the full sentences for the abbreviation in first use (fer exp. COVID, SARS)
4- Method: heterogenity of effect size using the PRISMA .... ? Whats mean ? there is no verb? please edit all of the manuscript for typographical and grammatical errors.
5- please delete the “Different” in methods. we searched different databases. Using the word "different" creates the expectation that you should mention the names of the database.
6- please remove searched keywords from methos section in abstract
7- method section in abstract: Which test did you use for heterogeneity?
8- please remove "Two authors independently ....."
9- method section in abstract: Which test did you use for meta-analysis?
10- The method section in abstract must be included: database, time period, checklists, tests, and softwares
11- conclusion section in abstract: Which test was better?
12- conclusion section in abstract: these methods .... What methods?
13- please re-write the conclusion based on the aim of the study. Which test is better? Why we must use that test? What is added to our knowledge?
14- Please don’t use the abbreviation in keywords
Methods:
15- Dear it is recommended to re-write this section based on the PRISMA checklist included: Study Registration, Search Strategy, Eligibility Criteria, Study Selection, Quality measurement, Data Extraction, Statistical Analysis, Data Report
16- Why you select this period time? jan-nov 2020
17- In what software did you enter the references? (Endnote?)
18- How you solve the disagreement between the authors?
19- In statistical analysis: What did you do to check the publication bias?
20- In statistical analysis: Was the sensitivity test performed to ensure the consistency of the results? Please mention
21- Why did you use the ANOVA and t-test?
22- What test was used to examine the heterogeneity of the studies? Explain how to interpret the degree of heterogeneity
23- Describe the use of Forrest Plot
Result Section:
24- Dear it is recommended to present the results in subheadings included: study

selection (how many studies in first, the reasons for remove studies, the number of studies in end of the process), characteristics of studies, and then main findings. Please see the published studies for this

25- please add brackets before dots (.). foe exp: ..... sensitivity. (p<0.05 .... Must be edit to >> sensitivity (p<0.05).

Conclusion section:

26- Please summarize this section to 4-5 lines. This section must be included the main findings. Which test was better and why? Are we can use the mentioned test?

Declarations:

27- Please add the full declaration statement such as acknowledgement, conflict of interest, data availability, funding, ethical approval

References:

28- Please use the same format for refs. Names, title, journal, year, issue, volume, pages

29- please edit the refs based on the NLM catalog and journal format

30- It is recommended to change the refs from medRxiv preprint or bioRxiv such as refs 34, 36, 40, 43, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55

Major request:

31- You have 48 studies in review. Please add a main table for characteristics all of the 48 studies. I can not find the references for included studies so I can not have a decision for results. It is necessary

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Title: A Meta-Analysis on the Comparison of the Sensitivity of Three Different Test Methods Used in the Diagnosis of COVID-19

Replies to referees: (Changes made appear in "track changes" mode in the main article file.)

Title:

1- The word “different” is not necessary. Only three tests were used….

Title edited.

summary

2- Purpose: There is no reason for this review. Please explain the importance of the title

“Accurate detection of the global epidemic-causing COVID-19 is for disease surveillance and control. Additionally, Quantitative RT-qPCR has been accepted as a reference test and is widely used. However, RT-qPCR applications are not possible in all health centers. Therefore, tests with widespread use in the diagnosis of infectious disease should be evaluated from all perspectives, also to assess its potential role in the prognosis and management of COVID-19 patients. Thus, our manuscript has a great importance as it will clarify this situation.” text added at the end of the introduction.

3- Please use full sentences for abbreviation at first use (fer exp. COVID, SARS)

Open cases are written.

4- Method: Heterogeneity of effect size using PRISMA…. ? What is the meaning ? no verbs Please edit the entire article for spelling and grammatical errors.

Related sentence “This study was prepared according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines, and the total effect sizes and heterogeneity of the included studies were analyzed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA) software.” arranged as

5- Delete the "As" in the methods. We searched different databases. Using the word "different" creates the expectation that you need to mention database names.

I added which databases we use to the summary-method section.

6- Please remove the searched keywords from the methods section in the summary.

Search words have been removed from the abstract.

7- Method section in the summary: Which test did you use for heterogeneity?

“Effect sizes and heterogeneity (with I2 value) of the studies included with CMA were calculated and forest plot analyzes were performed.” specified in the sentence.

8- Please remove "Two authors independent ….."

The phrase "Two authors are independent ….." was removed.

9- Method section in the summary: Which test did you use for the meta-analysis?

It is stated in the material and method section.

10- The summary should include the method section: database, time frame, checklists, tests and software

“SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Version 25 and CMA softwares were used for statistical analysis One-way ANOVA analysis and paired sample t-test were performed in SPSS. The effect sizes and heterogeneity were calculated and forest plot analyzes were made of the studies with CMA.” sentence is added to the end of the method part.

11- Conclusion in summary: Which test was better?

“As a result of the analyzes made, the sensitivity and true positivity rate of the ELISA test was found to be the highest.” sentence added.

12- Conclusion in summary: these methods…. Which methods?

Added “POC, ELISA and CT methods”.

13- Please rewrite the result in accordance with the purpose of the study. Which test is better? Why should we use this test? What has been added to our knowledge?

“Among these methods, ELISA has been found to be a more appropriate method in the diagnosis of COVID-19 compared to POC and CT, due to its high sensitivity and true positivity rate, low false-negative rate, short processing time and simple study procedure. Although helpful in diagnosis, confirmation of ELISA results by PCR is still the gold standard.” sentences were added to the end of the conclusion.

14- Please do not use abbreviations in keywords.

Keywords “Coronavirus Disease of 2019, point of care test, enzyme linked immunosorbent assay, Reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction, computer tomography.” updated as.

methods:

15- Dear, it is recommended to rewrite this section according to the PRISMA checklist which includes: Study Record, Search Strategy, Eligibility Criteria, Study Selection, Quality measurement, Data Extraction, Statistical Analysis, Data Report

Quality assessments were made and organized in the text. Table 1

16- Why do you choose this period? January-November 2020

This date range was chosen within the framework of the study plan to present the cross-sectional data.

17- In which software did you enter the references? (Final note?)

References were written manually in word format. It's not a "final note".

18- How do you resolve the conflict between the authors?

Disputes between the authors were resolved by scientific consensus.

19- In statistical analysis: What did you do to control publication bias?

Publication bias was evaluated with logit event rate and standard error funnel plot. Also used Duval and Tweedie's crop and fill method (Fixed effect Point estimation; 0.37265)

20- In statistical analysis: Was sensitivity testing done to ensure consistency of results? please mention

There is no decision questionnaire that may create a need for our work during the review process.

21- Why did you use ANOVA and t-test?

The ANOVA test was used to investigate whether there was a statistical difference between sample type and test sensitivity. The t test was used to investigate whether tp and fn values differed statistically between studies.

22- Which test was used to examine the heterogeneity of the studies? Explain how to interpret the degree of heterogeneity

Heterogeneity measurements were made according to the Cochran Q Heterogeneity test. Q value and I2 were found to be 461,731 and 96,535, respectively.

Heterogeneity in meta-analysis refers to variation in study results between studies. Thresholds for interpretation of I2 can be misleading, as the significance of the discrepancy depends on several factors. A rough guide to interpretation is as follows:

0% to 40%: may not matter;

30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity*;

50% to 90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity*;

75% to 100%: significant heterogeneity*.

23- Explain the use of Forrest Plot

Forest Plot was used to show the differences between individual studies. The process was done with CMA (V2).

Conclusion Section:

24- Dear, it is recommended to present the results under sub-headings: study selection (how many studies first, reasons for discontinuation, number of studies at the end of the process), characteristics of studies, and then main findings. Please refer to published studies for this

Findings section is titled.

25- Please add parentheses before dots (.). enemy exp: ….. susceptibility. ($p<0.05$ …. >> should be regulated with precision ($p<0.05$).

"($p<0.05$)." formatted.

Conclusion section:

26- Please summarize this section up to 4-5 lines. This section should include the main findings. Which test was better and why? Can we use the mentioned test?

The results are summarized.

Statements:

27- Please include full disclosure statement such as acceptance, conflict of interest, data availability, funding, ethical approval.

All titles added.

References:

28- Please use the same format for references. Names, title, journal, year, issue, volume, pages

29- please organize references according to NLM catalog and journal format

30- It is recommended to replace references from medRxiv preprint or bioRxiv such as 34, 36, 40, 43, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55.

Resources edited. Some of the medRxiv formatted articles have been changed. It is still in the bibliography as no other articles have been found to replace the others.

Major request:

31- You have 48 studies in the review. Please include a master table for all 48 studies. I can't find references to the included studies, so I can't make a judgment on the results. This is necessary.

Table 6 has been added.

-Which test was used to check for heterogeneity of articles?

Heterogeneity measurements were made according to Cochran Q Heterogeneity test. Q value and I2 were found 461,731 and 96,535 respectively

-Were the studies heterogeneous?

Studies shown considerable heterogeneity I2=96,535.

-If heterogeneous, which model did you use?

The Fixed model was used to evaluate heterogeneity.

Başlık: COVID-19 Tanısında Kullanılan Üç Farklı Test Yönteminin Duyarlılıklarının Karşılaştırılması Üzerine Bir Meta-Analiz

Hakemlere yanıtlar:

Başlık:

1- “Farklı” kelimesine gerek yoktur. Sadece üç test kullanıldı… .

Başlık düzenlendi.

Özet

2- Amaç: Bu gözden geçirmenin hiçbir nedeni yoktur. Lütfen başlığın önemini açıklayınız

“Accurate detection of the global epidemic-causing COVID-19 is imperative for disease surveillance and control. Additionally, Quantitative RT-qPCR has been accepted as a reference test and is widely used. However, RT-qPCR applications are not possible in all health centers. Therefore, tests with widespread use in the diagnosis of infectious disease should be evaluated from all perspectives, also to assess its potential role in the prognosis and management of COVID-19 patients. Thus, our manuscript has a great importance as it will clarify this situation.” metni giriş kısmının sonuna eklendi.

3- Lütfen ilk kullanımda kısaltma için tam cümleleri kullanınız (fer exp. COVID, SARS)

Açık halleri yazıldı.

4- Yöntem: PRISMA kullanılarak etki büyüklüğünün heterojenliği…. ? Anlamı ne ? fiil yok mu Lütfen yazım ve dilbilgisi hataları için makalenin tamamını düzenleyin.

İlgili cümle “This study was prepared according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines, and the total effect sizes and heterogeneity of the included studies were analyzed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA) software.” olarak düzenlenmiştir.

5- Yöntemlerdeki “Farklı”yı siliniz. farklı veritabanlarını aradık. "Farklı" kelimesinin kullanılması, veritabanı adlarından bahsetmeniz gerektiği beklentisini yaratır.

Hangi veritabanlarını kullandığımızı özet-metot kısmına ekledim.

6- Lütfen aranan anahtar kelimeleri özette metotlar bölümünden kaldırın.

Arama kelimeleri özetten kaldırıldı.

7- Özette yöntem bölümü: Heterojenlik için hangi testi kullandınız?

“Effect sizes and heterogeneity (with I^2 value) of the studies included with CMA were calculated and forest plot analyzes were performed.” cümlesinde belirtilmiştir.

8- Lütfen "İki yazar bağımsız ….." öğesini kaldırın.

"İki yazar bağımsız ….." ifadesi çıkarıldı.

9- Özette yöntem bölümü: Meta-analiz için hangi testi kullandınız?

Materyal ve metot kısmında belirtilmiştir.

10- Özette yöntem bölümü yer almalıdır: veri tabanı, zaman dilimi, kontrol listeleri, testler ve yazılımlar

“SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Version 25 and CMA softwares were used for statistical analysis One-way ANOVA analysis and paired sample t-test were performed in SPSS. The effect sizes and heterogeneity were calculated and forest plot analyzes were made of the studies with CMA.” cümlesi metot kısmının sonuna eklendi.

11- Özet olarak sonuç bölümü: Hangi test daha iyiydi?

“As a result of the analyzes made, the sensitivity and true positivity rate of the ELISA test was found to be the highest.” cümlesi eklendi.

12- Özet olarak sonuç bölümü: bu yöntemler…. Hangi yöntemler?

“POC, ELISA and CT methods” eklendi.

13- Lütfen çalışmanın amacına uygun olarak sonucu yeniden yazınız. Hangi test daha iyi? Neden bu testi kullanmalıyız? Bilgimize neler eklendi?

“Among these methods, ELISA has been found to be a more appropriate method in the diagnosis of COVID-19 compared to POC and CT, due to its high sensitivity and true positivity rate, low false-negative rate, short processing time and simple study procedure.

Although helpful in diagnosis, confirmation of ELISA results by PCR is still the gold standard.” cümleleri conclusion sonuna eklendi.

14- Lütfen anahtar kelimelerde kısaltma kullanmayınız.

anahtar kelimeler “Coronavirus Disease of 2019, point of care test, enzyme linked immunosorbent assay, Reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction, computer tomography.” şeklinde güncellendi.

yöntemler:

15- Sevgili, bu bölümün aşağıdakileri içeren PRISMA kontrol listesine göre yeniden yazılması önerilir: Çalışma Kaydı, Arama Stratejisi, Uygunluk Kriterleri, Çalışma Seçimi, Kalite ölçümü, Veri Çıkarma, İstatistiksel Analiz, Veri Raporu

Quality assessments were made and organized in the text. Table 1

16- Neden bu süreyi seçiyorsunuz? ocak-kasım 2020

Bu tarih aralığı, kesitsel verileri sunmak için çalışma planı çerçevesinde seçilmiştir.

17- Referansları hangi yazılımda girdiniz? (Son not?)

Referanslar word formatında manuel olarak yazıldı. “Son not” şeklinde değil.

18- Yazarlar arasındaki anlaşmazlığı nasıl çözersiniz?

Yazarlar arasındaki anlaşmazlıklar bilimsel fikir birliği ile çözüldü.

19- İstatistiksel analizde: Yayın yanlılığını kontrol etmek için ne yaptınız?

Yayın yanlılığı, logit olay oranı ile standart hata huni grafiği ile değerlendirildi. Ayrıca Duval ve Tweedie'nin kırp ve doldur yöntemi kullanıldı (Sabit etki Nokta tahmini; 0,37265)

20- İstatistiksel analizde: Sonuçların tutarlılığını sağlamak için duyarlılık testi yapıldı mı? Lütfen bahsedin

İnceleme sürecinde çalışmamız için ihtiyaç oluşturabilecek herhangi bir karar anketi bulunmamaktadır.

21- ANOVA ve t-testini neden kullandınız?

ANOVA testi örnek türü ve test duyarlılığı arasında istatistiksel olarak bir fark olup olmadığını araştırmak için kullanıldı. t testi tp ve fn değerlerinin çalışmalar arasında istatistiksel olarak farklılık gösterip göstermediğini araştırmak için kullanıldı.

22- Çalışmaların heterojenliğini incelemek için hangi test kullanıldı? Heterojenlik derecesinin nasıl yorumlanacağını açıklayın

Heterojenlik ölçümleri Cochran Q Heterojenlik testine göre yapılmıştır. Q değeri ve I2 sırasıyla 461.731 ve 96.535 bulundu.

Meta-analizdeki heterojenlik, çalışmalar arasındaki çalışma sonuçlarındaki varyasyonu ifade eder. Tutarsızlığın önemi birkaç faktöre bağlı olduğundan, I2'nin yorumlanması için eşikler yanıltıcı olabilir. Yorumlama için kaba bir kılavuz aşağıdaki gibidir:

%0 ila %40: önemli olmayabilir;

%30 ila %60: orta düzeyde heterojenliği temsil edebilir*;

%50 ila %90: önemli ölçüde heterojenliği temsil edebilir*;

%75 ila %100: önemli ölçüde heterojenlik*.

23- Forrest Plot'un kullanımını açıklayın

Forest Plot, bireysel çalışmalar arasındaki farklılıkları göstermek için kullanıldı. İşlem CMA (V2) ile yapılmıştır.

Sonuç Bölümü:

24- Sevgili, sonuçların çalışma seçimi (ilk olarak kaç çalışma, çalışma kaldırılma nedenleri, süreç sonundaki çalışma sayısı), çalışmaların özellikleri ve ardından ana bulgular olmak üzere alt başlıklarda sunulması tavsiye edilir. Bunun için lütfen yayınlanmış çalışmalara bakın

Bulgular bölümü başlıklandırıldı.

25- Lütfen noktalardan (.) önce parantez ekleyiniz. düşman exp: ….. duyarlılık. ($p<0.05$ …. >> hassasiyette düzenlenmelidir ($p<0.05$).

“($p<0.05$).” şeklinde düzenlendi.

Sonuç bölümü:

26- Lütfen bu bölümü 4-5 satıra kadar özetleyiniz. Bu bölümde ana bulgulara yer verilmelidir. Hangi sınav daha iyiydi ve neden? Bahsedilen testi kullanabilir miyiz?

Sonuçlar özetlendi.

Beyanlar:

27- Lütfen kabul, çıkar çatışması, veri mevcudiyeti, finansman, etik onay gibi tam beyan beyanını ekleyin.

Tüm başlıklar eklendi.

Referanslar:

28- Referanslar için lütfen aynı formatı kullanınız. İsimler, başlık, dergi, yıl, sayı, cilt, sayfalar

29- lütfen referansları NLM kataloğuna ve dergi formatına göre düzenleyin

30- medRxiv preprint veya bioRxiv'den referansların 34, 36, 40, 43, 47, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55 gibi değiştirilmesi önerilir.

Başlıca istek:

31- İncelemede 48 çalışmanız var. Lütfen 48 çalışmanın tümü için bir ana tablo ekleyin. Dahil edilen çalışmaların referanslarını bulamıyorum, bu yüzden sonuçlar için bir karar veremiyorum. Bu gerekli.

Tablo 6 eklenmiştir.

Makalelerin heterojenliğini kontrol etmek için hangi test kullanıldı?

Heterogeneity measurements were made according to Cochran Q Heterogeneity test. Q value and I^2 were found 461,731 and 96,535 respectively

Çalışmalar heterojen miydi?

Studies shown considerable heterogeneity I^2=96,535.

Heterojen ise hangi modeli kullandınız?

The Fixed model was used to evaluate heterogeneity.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

All relevant changes were made in the main article file in "track changes" mode.

Summary: should be changed to abstract

*Summary: changed to abstract

1- Purpose: There is no reason for this review. Please explain the importance of the title

You should include your explanations (explanation below) in the summary section.

“Accurate detection of the global epidemic causing COVID-19 is for disease surveillance and control. In addition, Quantitative RT-qPCR has been accepted as a reference test and is widely used. However, RT-qPCR applications are not possible in all health centers. Therefore, tests commonly used in the diagnosis of infectious disease should be evaluated from all angles to also assess their potential role in the prognosis and management of COVID-19 patients. Therefore, our manuscript is of great importance as it will clarify this situation.” Text has been added to the end of the introduction.

*This explanation has been added to the summary section.

2- Please reduce the number of abstract words below 250 words. In summary, you have a lot of unnecessary data. For more information, I recommend checking out the following article:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2020.108347

*The summary is structured.

login:

3- Please add a bibliography for the last paragraph of the introduction.

*A bibliography has been added to the last paragraph of the introduction.

methods:

15- Dear, it is recommended that you rewrite this section according to the PRISMA checklist which includes: Study Record, Search Strategy, Eligibility Criteria, Study Selection, Quality measurement, Data Extraction, Statistical Analysis, Data Report

*Methods section is organized as “According to the PRISMA checklist: Study Record, Search Strategy, Eligibility Criteria, Study Selection, Quality measurement, Data Extraction, Statistical Analysis, Data Report”.

Please add study record and study selection sections. Please see below:

-Study selection in the method section: What did you do to ensure that the article selection process was correct? It is also called “Call validation and data selection”.

*“All articles were searched using keywords in Google Scholar, NCBI and Medline databases, and at this stage, the articles found in the specified databases were collected. Articles that did

not meet the inclusion criteria outlined above were subsequently excluded. The full texts of the articles we included were accessed and reviewed independently. Results were compared and uncertainties in included and excluded articles were discussed and resolved. In this meta-analysis, we included studies comparing the sensitivity rates of test methods used in the diagnosis of COVID-19 with a reference RT-PCR standard. Clinical trials with 50 or more patients reporting the sensitivity of POC, ELISA, and CT tests for the diagnosis of COVID-19 were included." paragraph has been added.

-Study selection in the conclusion section: The result of the actions you made during the article selection stage. This section should provide numbers.

*Related numbers have been added to the results study selection section. "As a result of the literature review, 7500 studies were found suitable for the keywords. After repetitive studies were eliminated, 5018 articles remained. (Figure 1) 48 studies that met the search criteria were included, excluding reviews, editorial letters, case reports, modeling or economics studies, articles that did not express data clearly and had a sample size of less than fifty. It was not compared with PCR. Among the 48 studies included in the meta-analysis, most of the studies on POC, ELISA and CT methods were reported in China. In the studies included in the meta-analysis, it was determined that the most used method was CT (10-58). (Table 2)"

Please separate the following sections: Quality measurement, Data Extraction, Statistical Analysis

*Relevant sections have been separated.

-Quality assessment is wrong. You should use EQUATOR checklists (like STROBE, COSMIN, ...). please use one of these checklists and attach the results of the assessment to: Results section > Features https://www.equator-network.org/

*The quality assessment we made is an assessment that has an example in the literature. Making the evaluations you want requires a long process.

17- In which software did you enter the references? (Final note?)

My original comment: In what software did you enter the references? (Final note?)

First of all, please note that "Final Note" is the official name of reference management software. In addition, you should use software to 1- add the appropriate works and scan them for copies, ... 2- cite them. It is necessary to use a software.

1- Endonote (https://endnote.com/) 2- I recommend Mendeley (https://www.mendeley.com/).

**Sources entered manually. It is not in endnote format. The bibliography has already been arranged in accordance with the journal format.

18- How do you resolve the conflict between the authors?

Disputes between the authors were resolved by scientific consensus. You must add an expression in the Study selection section in the Method section.

*See “Disputes between the authors were resolved by scientific consensus.” sentence added.

19- In statistical analysis: What did you do to control publication bias?

You must add an expression to the method section.

Publication bias was evaluated with logit event rate and standard error funnel plot. Also used Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill method (Fixed effect Point estimate; 0.37265)

* To the statistical analysis section, “Publication bias was measured by forest plot analysis.” sentence added.

20- In statistical analysis: Was sensitivity testing done to ensure consistency of results? please mention

• It's about results! Please specify the desired comment

There is no decision survey that may create a need for our work during the review process.

*Not done.

22- Which test was used to examine the heterogeneity of the studies? Explain how to interpret the degree of heterogeneity

You must add an expression to the method section.

*In the method section, “The effect sizes and heterogeneity (with I2 and Q value) of the studies included in the CMA were calculated and forest plot analyzes were performed.” sentence added.

Heterogeneity measurements were made according to the Cochran Q Heterogeneity test. Q value and I2 were found to be 461,731 and 96,535, respectively.

Heterogeneity in meta-analysis refers to variation in study results between studies. Thresholds for interpretation of I2 can be misleading, as the significance of the discrepancy depends on several factors. A rough guide to interpretation is as follows:

0% to 40%: may not matter;

30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity*;

50% to 90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity*;

75% to 100%: significant heterogeneity*.

*This paragraph has been added to the method section. “Heterogeneity in meta-analysis refers to variation in study results between studies. Thresholds for interpretation of I2 can be misleading, as the significance of the discrepancy depends on several factors. A rough guide to interpretation is as follows:

0% to 40%: may not matter;

30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity;

50% to 90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity;

75% to 100%: significant heterogeneity.”

Conclusion section:

Phrases:

27- Please include full disclosure statement such as acceptance, conflict of interest, data availability, funding, ethical approval.

Original comment: Please include full disclosure statement such as consent, conflict of interest, data availability, funding, ethical approval.

*Already, “Conflict of interest, Data availability, Funding, Ethical approval” sections are available at the end of the text.

1- Acknowledgment is a section where you thank the co-authors who are not listed as authors .... and for the grant number.

*The acknowledgment part is not included in our article.

2- What is acceptance? This section is not in any of our articles.

* Such a part does not exist in our article.

3- It is recommended that you include your approval of the helsinki statement in the ethical approval and also add an ethics registration code.

* “All authors endorsed the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was not obtained for the study.” An ethical approval was not obtained for the meta-analysis.

References:

30- It is recommended to replace medRxiv preprint or bioRxiv references. Dear thesis references don't make sense. These articles are not reviewed and published, so you cannot cite them. please edit

*We cannot replace studies in medRxiv format with another study. Most of them consist of studies that we included in the meta-analysis.

Major request:

31- You have 48 studies in the review. Please include a master table for all 48 studies. I cannot find references to the included studies, so I cannot make a judgment about the results. This is necessary.

Dear What is Table 2?

*Table 2 lists the characteristics of all 48 studies. References are in the first column. Next to the table name, reference numbers are written as (10-58).

You said that table 6 was added, but table 6 is about statistics...

*Included in Table 2. Table 6 is wrong.

In addition, you should include references to studies in tables 2 or 6!

*Table 6 is the statistics table.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)