1. Please rewrite some complex sentences.
Response: I already rewrote it and sent the manuscript to Cambridge Proofreading for English revisions.

2. For the abstract, add one sentence demonstrating a knowledge gap. Now that you've outlined what we already know, tell us what we don't know. How does your work address a specific question?
Response: I already addressed the attributes of CNN and RNN utilization “in this framework, the attributes of CNNs were utilized to extract features and those of RNNs to calculate dependencies and continuity of information”.

3. While it mentions that the method has "high level of dependability and comparable performance," it does not provide any information about what this means in terms of the accuracy, sensitivity, or specificity of the method.
Response: I already revised that sentence to "Based on the experimental results, the proposed method is highly effective in distinguishing lung diseases in 14 both X-ray and CT images and may therefore facilitate rapid and easy detection of COVID-19".

4. To make the introduction and discussion more substantial, the authors may wish to introduce more examples and discussion. (such as 10.1016/j.asoc.2021.107918; 10.1016/j.chemolab.2022.104695, etc)
Response: I’ve described the papers 10.1016/j.asoc.2021.107918 and 10.1016/j.chemolab.2022.104695 in the introduction and discussion.

5. Please give some details about resolution each original dataset. And how to control.
Response: I added more details about resolution for each original dataset in Topic 2.1: Data Sets and explained the pre-processing in Topic 3.1: Data Pre-processing.

6. Line 74-77: We increase the scope of disease diagnosis by making use of both X-ray images and CT scans. This allows us to take advantage of the computational speed and prediction accuracy of CNNs and RNNs, respectively, in order to forecast X-ray and CT scans of COVID-19 images.
Response: I'm sorry, I thought your question was in point 7.

7. Please add a result about "computational speed" ?
Response: I already added Training time duration and test time duration are addressed in Table 2 and described at line 236–242.

8. Line 105-106 "the remaining images were excluded, due to their small resolution." What is the minimum resolution required for this research? Please add references.
Response: I’m sorry for the misunderstanding. I already revised this sentence to "The remaining images were randomly excluded to balance the number of data in each classification".

9. Line 193: Why this research use 300 epochs for training? Please add references.
Response: I already added the reference [32] for it.

10. Line 237: "During the testing phase, Figure 6 depicts the confusion matrix of our proposed". The "Figure 6" is not refer to the figure directly. Please edit it.
Response: I already fixed it.

11. Table 3. For Saxena et al. [31] show F1-score as 93.78 which is higher than the proposed method, so it should be bold.
Response: I already fixed it and also include your suggest papers (10.1016/j.asoc.2021.107918 and 10.1016/j.chemolab.2022.) to Table 3.

12. Figure 4. The combined CNN–RNN network structure. The figure shown the dropout dashed line, but there is no mention about "dropout" in the context. Please add more details and references.
Response: I already added more details about dropout in the sentence "In the fully connected layer, the dropout technique was used to avoid overfitting in the networks" and references to [30,31].

13. Figure 4. The combined CNN–RNN network structure. Is the last layer of among VGG19, ResNet152V2, and DenseNet121 used same reshape parameters for combining with the RNN model? Please add more details and references.
Response: I already added more details about reshape parameters for combining CNN-RNN in the sentence “We reshaped the output of VGG19 (none, 7, 7, and 512), ResNet152V2 (none, 7, 7, and 2,048), and DenseNet121 (none, 7, 7, and 1,024) to (49,512), (49, 2048), and (49,1024) respectively.” and references to [11].

14. For the Table 3, Is it fair to compare the other research with the number of dataset lower than the proposed method?
Response: I think the utilization of the higher number of images, which had several sizes, brightness levels, noise, and angles of view to evaluate the performance of this method. It shows greater flexibility to handle input data and higher reliability. In Table 3, the methods of refs. [35, 36] are similar in number of dataset to the proposed methods.

15. The authors should describe more clearly the ethics. For ethical considerations, experiments including human data and relevant approval protocols should properly be documented.
Response: We're concerned and cautious about it, but in this research, we used an existing public dataset and there is no infringement on the person.

16. Please add limitation or drawbacks in this work?
Response: I already added limitations in this work at line 278-281.

17. For ‘Conclusions’, the challenges in studying this work, that the authors have addressed, should be emphasized.
Response: I already added the challenges of this work in the sentence "To evaluate the proposed approaches, we collected a total of 16,210 chest X-ray and CT images from various sources, which had several sizes, brightness levels, noise, and angles of view" and also included the future work in line 299-301.