Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

------------------------------------------------------

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Good

Remarks

Evaluate: PORT / PSI versus SOFA scores to predict hospital mortality in COVID-19 patients

Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

The manuscript is novel and very interesting. I suggest it be published after taking into account the recommendations made in the attached document.

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

------------------------------------------------------
The author used observational, analytical, and retrospective investigations of consecutive patients hospitalized for COVID-19 from April 1, 2020, to May 31, 2020, to perform research on the Pneumonia Security Index to predict the prognosis of community-acquired pneumonia in a patient from Mexico City. Thus, this manuscript is appropriate for the Journal of Microbes, Infection, and Chemotherapy.

Ethic: The Helsinki Declaration is mentioned by the author as the study's ethical foundation. Furthermore, the Institutional Ethics Committee approved the study protocol (501-010-01-21, CEI-1-2021) with an exemption from the requirement of informed consent because it was a risk-free and retrospective design investigation.

Result: the authors need to make Table 1 and Table 2 more clear. Additional explanation needs to be written for "Edad and Edad-10". Furthermore, Table 4 should be clarified with some notes as information. Overall, all of the tables should be revised to make them more understandable to the reader

Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

The author must make all tables, including some footnotes, understandable to the reader. Additionally, the discussion may be improved.

CHANGES

-All changes are in red.

-Language corrections were made on all the manuscript.

Reviewer A

-References were changed following the Vancouver format.

Reviewer B

-Tables 1,2, and 4 were revised and edited.

-In the Discussion, we described the findings in previous studies that evaluated the identical prognostic scores.