

Reviewer comments:

This is an excellent review of the use of extracellular vesicles in liver transplantation. The only suggestions I have are: 1. Describe the different sizes of EV and whether/how this impacts on their cargo. Large EV results from apoptosis which has significant impact on indirect antigen presentation 2. There is very little information about the composition of the EV cargo in terms of pro- and anti-inflammatory molecules and whether this can be exploited as a therapeutic avenue

We are pleased to hear that the reviewers believe this to be an excellent review and thank them for their time and comments. We agree with the reviewer regarding the well documented heterogeneity of the EV pool. We have expanded the manuscript (underlined) and provided an additional figure to introduce readers to current understandings of EV subtypes and sizes. EV characterisation and classification is a complex area with methods of analysis constantly evolving and classification schemes shifting and which, to a large extent, is beyond the scope of our 'mini-review'. Thus, in addition to the changes in the manuscript and figures, we have also included references to the most pertinent recent literature/advances in this area.

Science editor comments:

Issues raised:

(1) The column should be minireviews;

Thank you, this is now changed.

(2) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions;

Author contributions section has now been included.

(3) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and

A PowerPoint is now provided of Figure 3. All other figures are original images and have been created by the authors using BioRender.com software (as referenced in the legends). These are not created in Powerpoint, however the PDFs with vectors are attached, allowing a degree of processing. However, as with original research figures, it is usually preferable for these to not be adapted.

(4) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. *This is now amended wherever possible, as requested (we note in some instances not available or N/A).*

Company editor in Chief comments:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, authors need to correct the issues raised by the editor to meet the publishing requirements. The relevant ethics documents are missing, and please double check the validity of the code entered in section of Corresponding Author's Editorial Board's or Reviewer's Code.

Many thanks. We have now addressed the editor's and the reviewer's points as highlighted. Please refer to manuscript for details.