Dear Sir,
Thank you for your e-mail and the valuable comments/suggestions of the reviewers.
Please find enclosed our manuscript entitled "Effectiveness of Vitamin D Supplementation for Management of SARS-COV-2: A Systematic Review/Meta-Analysis" modified according to the valuable recommendations of the reviewers; Modifications in RED.
Here we answer all inquiries/suggestions of the reviewers:

Reviewer C:
1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article
   Answer: Done. "Vitamin D Supplementation for Management of SARS-COV-2"

2. Summary: Maximum number of words per section.
   Answer: Modified, less 350 words.

3. Introduction: A more thorough literature review and a well-defined research question or hypothesis would enhance the introduction and make it more comprehensive.
   Answer: Modified.

4. Methodology: It would be helpful to provide more information about the search strategy used to identify relevant studies.
   Answer: Modified and updated.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?
   Answer: Systematic reviews and Meta-analysis are exempted from Ethical Committees Approvals.

6. Results: The manuscript does not appear to have a specific paragraph addressing ethical aspects, such as approval by an ethics committee, informed consent, or strict compliance with research ethics.
   Answer: Added after the statistical analysis section.

7. Discussion: "Limited Critical Analysis" and "Missing Commentary on Other Findings"
   Answer: Modified and updated.

8. Conclusions: The conclusions focus solely on the reductions in hospital stay and the need for artificial ventilation. They do not encompass the broader outcomes discussed in the study, such as the need for oxygen therapy, ICU admission, or fatal prognosis. Providing a more comprehensive summary of findings would be beneficial.
   Answer: Modified and updated.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.
   Answer: All references now follow Vancouver style.
10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written?  
Answer: English style was improved.

Reviewer D:

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article: Good  
Answer: Thank you.

2. Summary: It is too large, considering that many databases have extension limits.  
Answer: Modified, less 350 words.

3. Introduction: Good  
Answer: Thank you.

4. Methodology: You should mention search strategies or similar analysis.  
Answer: Modified and updated.

5. Ethical aspects. Yes  
Answer: Systematic reviews and Meta-analysis are exempted from Ethical Committees Approvals.  
Ethical Considerations: Added after the statistical analysis section.

6. Results: Good  
Answer: Thank you.

7. Discussion: Ok  
Answer: Thank you. Modified and improved.

8. Conclusions: OK  
Answer: Thank you. Modified and improved.

Answer: All references now follow Vancouver style.

10. Redaction. Needs some language corrections  
Answer: English style was improved.

11. Contributions. Ok  
Answer: Thank you.