

**Reviewer A**

No.	Comments	Reply action taken	Line number
1.a.	Please add more information or study have reported about the primers usually use for diagnostic SARS COV2 by using qPCR method.	Thank you for pointing this. We have added paragraph about the primers use for diagnostic SARS-CoV-2 PCR method.	Line 66 - 81
1.b.	Please state a brief conclusion in the last part of introduction.	We have added conclusion in the last part of introduction.	Line 86 - 90
2.a.	The discussion section on "primers" design requirements better is discussed in the "3.2.2 Primary Design" results (tables 1) or can be a short explanation, what is most important in conducting primer designs for qPCR in the introduction part.	We agree and have included "primers" design requirements in the "3.2.2 Primary Design"	Line 223 - 239
2.b.	Please this sub-topic can be combined with the first paragraph in the sub-topic primer design (3.2)	We have combined it.	
2.c.	Table 1 should be presented not in the form of a table image but retyped in a table	We have retyped in a table	Line 220, table 1
2.d.	Please briefly explained why the author compared the results only with Li et al. (2020) data?	Because we did the research, Li et al (2020) was the latest publication at that time. in this revision, we have made an update by adding Davi et al (2021) as well as a comparison	
3.	Comment on Conclusions: we suggest the author should make short conclusion	We agree and made it short	Line 367 - 372

**Reviewer B**

No.	Comments	Reply action taken	Line number
1.	General comment		
2.	Comment on Title: The composition of the title is not ideal, the mention of "Indonesia Based" is a bit confusing, and the word "in silico" is not needed.	We agree and have changed the title	Line 1 and 10
3.	Comment on Abstract: It is common sense not to put citations in the abstract. It is	Replaced as suggested	Line 24

	recommended that authors only refer to studies that are referred to as "previous studies."		
3.	Comment on Introduction: Two key studies related to this topic are really appropriate to put in the introduction but have not been referred to in this article ( <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.22207/JPAM.14.SPL1.42">http://dx.doi.org/10.22207/JPAM.14.SPL1.42</a> and <a href="https://doi.org/10.29238/teknolabjournal.v9i1.221">https://doi.org/10.29238/teknolabjournal.v9i1.221</a> ). Authors should review the two papers and then reconstruct the contents of the introduction.	We used Davi et al. (2021) is more up-to-date than the reviewer B's journal suggestion	
4.	Comment on Materials and Methods: The method is quite clear, but it is necessary to pay attention to the tenses in some parts.	We have tried to fix the tenses in some part of methods	Line 119 Line 126
5.a	Line 137 --> Kindly mention the percentage for clade G.	Added as suggested	Line 192
5.b	Line 137-138 --> "The SARS-CoV-2 found in Wuhan is similar to the one in East Java" --> Since Figure 1 contains more than 1 East Java, the authors need to define it more specifically.	Defined it as suggested	Line 193
5.c	Line 158-160 --> Kindly use only one quote format.	We changed Lorenz 2012 with Hendling & Barišić, 2019 and Jalali et al., 2017 to make the reference more up to date.	Line 223 - 239
5.d	Line 164 → The abbreviation of RdRp should have been mentioned at the first opportunity (Line 162).	Replaced as suggested	Line 203
5.e	Table 1 is not a table but a figure. Authors should change the format to a table. It also applies to Tables 2 and 3.	Replaced as suggested	
5.f	Line 181 → "The three pairs of primers listed above" → Avoid	Replaced as suggested	Line 240 Line 251

	using the words “above,” “below,” and “beside.” Mention the identity of the referenced illustration directly (Table 1).		
5.g	Apart from Li et al., authors may consider another more up-to-date reference ( <a href="https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-80363-5">https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-80363-5</a> ) to compare in Figure	We used Davi et al. (2021) is more up-to-date than the reviewer B’s journal suggestion	Line 220
5.h	Lines 251 to 257 require references.	Added as suggested	Line 338
5.i	If possible, Table 3 should be combined with Table 1 and compared side-by-side because it is uncommon for authors to present full data from other studies in a single illustration (albeit in different formats).	Combined as suggested	Line 220 Table 1
6	Comment on Conclusions: As with abstracts, it is uncommon to cite other studies at the conclusion.	Replaced as suggested	Line 370 - 372
7	Comment on References: The authors need to add some recent references relevant to the study.	The references have already added some new references (highlighted), from 15 to 27 references	
8	Comment on Figures: It is recommended that authors use a histogram with a different color in Figure 2.	Replaced as suggested	Figure 2
9	Comment on Tables: All tables need to be reformatted so that they are truly tabular (not figures).	Reformatted as suggested	