

Response to Editors and Reviewers

Response to Editors

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response: Thanks. Before submitting the R1 version, we sent it to the Editage Language Serve to polish the language of the whole manuscript. We hope the revised manuscript could reach the language quality required by the journal. The language editing certificate is attached in the R1 submission.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: We really appreciate the editors for giving us the opportunity to revise the manuscript. We have made efforts to revise it by self-correction and language polishing. We made all the two figures decomposable, and each decomposable figure is organized into a single PowerPoint file. All the figures in the manuscript are original, so we have added Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022 to the bottom right-hand side of the figures in PPT. We also made uniform presentation for figure legends. Highlights was added in the R1 manuscript. For the references, we tried our best to cite the most recent and key original studies, and the reference list has been greatly revised. We hope the revised manuscript can meet the

requirements of your valuable journal.

Response to Reviewer #1

Comments:

1. The review is well written but rather long, with a lot of repeated information. I particularly appreciate the liver histopathological results highlighted by the authors. I suggest the author revise the structure of the review; Introduction should be followed by pathophysiology - potential mechanisms of liver injury.

Response: We thank the reviewer for these insightful suggestions. We have revised and changed the structure of this review. In addition, we have removed the “pathophysiology potential mechanisms of liver injury” part after the introduction.

Response to Reviewer #2

Comments:

1. The review is very topical and well written. Few suggestion. The review is very lengthy with repeat informations at occusions. There is also some irrelevant details for example author discussed in detail effect of diabetes. I suggest author should focus on liver. I suggest author revise the structure of review and start with Introduction followed by pathophysiology, common patterns of liver enyzmese impairment and interpretation, patients with no liver disese, and patinets with chronic liver disease. It will be worth considering adding a table if possible to summarise.

Response: We thank the reviewer for these professional suggestions. We have reduced the unnecessary information of the review and focused on liver. We have changed the structure of this review and added a table to summarize the impact of liver disease on liver function and COVID-19.