Response to reviewers' queries

Reviewer 1:

S.No	Query	Reply
1	Page 3, Abstract, Results section, line 4 from bottom: Change "glycaemic" to "glycaemia"	Thank you for your suggestion. We have made the correction as per your suggestion (page 4).
2	Page 5, Introduction, line 3 from top: Change "It's prevalence" to "Its prevalence"	Thank you for your suggestion. We have made the correction as per your suggestion (page 5).
3	Page 15, Discussion, line 11 from top: While osmotic diuresis definitely decreases body weight, it is an adverse effect of glucosuria because it causes symptomatic, and in advanced cases potentially life threatening, hypovolemia. My suggestion is to add a statement that unlike the other weight-reducing effects of SLGT-2 inhibitors, which are potentially beneficial, osmotic diuresis is clearly an adverse effect.	Thank you for your suggestion. We have made the corrections as per your suggestion (page 14).

Reviewer 2:

S.No	Query	Reply
1	There are several language, grammar errors throughout the paper.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have corrected the grammatical errors as far as possible.
2	The authors should write clearly the information about the included RCTs & observational studies, including the numbers of patients and they characteristics.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have added the necessary information in the tables (pages 24-27).
3	The authors should clearly define the primary and secondary outcome measures.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have added the information on primary and secondary outcomes (page 6).
4	According to the title and aim of the review the effects of SGLT-2 on NAFLD was a primary outcome, so authors should give more detailed information according to this aspect (namely describe the influence of SGLT-2 based on the hard data).	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made necessary corrections to the manuscript as per your suggestions (page 9).
5	The results section should be enlarged by increasing the	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made necessary corrections to

	information about the primary outcome and probably shortened by reducing the secondary outcome section.	the manuscript as per your suggestions (pages 9-11)
6	Discussion section should also be more focused mainly on NAFLD. The citations should be given throughout the text accordingly	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made necessary corrections to the manuscript as per your suggestions (pages 11-15)
7	English should be polished.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have improved the quality of English.

Reviewer 3:

S.No	Query	Reply
Language & style		
1	There are occasional language errors (grammar, syntax and even spellings) in the manuscript the need corrections. Therefore, authors are recommended to rectify these by a thorough scrutiny of the entire manuscript probably with the help of a language expert.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have improved the quality of English.
Abstract		
2	It is worth mentioning the total number cases analysed in the entire study and both RCTs & observational cohorts to give readers a perspective of the impact of the intervention with SGLT-2 inhibitors.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have added the necessary information (page 3).
3	You should change the conclusion section completely and mention "based on ……. (low-grade/ moderate) level of evidence, SGLT-2i appears to improve hepatic …. ? parameters". As this is a systematic review, you may	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made the necessary corrections (page 4)

	also suggest future implications of research here.	
Introduction		
4	Grammar errors in the third sentence of first paragraph and second sentence of the third paragraph (please change these types of errors in the entire manuscript by thorough scrutiny; I am unable to point out each as there are several of them). Modify the third sentence in the third paragraph as the statement is not fully correct scientifically.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made the necessary corrections (page 5).
Methods		
5	This section should clearly define the primary and secondary outcome measures. It appears as if you look at the effects of SGLT-2i on NAFLD as primary outcomes in the study, but this should be consistent throughout the paper (the results and discussion sections are not mentioning much about the same).! Currently, the authors	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made the necessary corrections (pages 5-6).

	giggle between diabetes, insulin resistance, BMI and NAFLD outcomes without a focused systematic approach to the review that doesn't appear scientifically very sound.	
6	The search strategy and key word search are mentioned as very vague in this section and I can't understand how you combined the search queries. It would be worth reporting the search strategy as a table in the supplementary files to ensure the search is reproducible to the reviewer/ reader.	The keywords were combined using the Boolean operators 'OR' and 'AND'. Many keywords appear similar because the difference between them is minimal. Eg. "NASH", " Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis", "Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis" and " Non alcoholic steatohepatitis" differ by the space between the individual words or the presence of hyphen in one keyword. We have added a supplementary table as per your suggestion (pages 6-7 ; pages 1-2 in supplementary)
7	The Cochrane collaboration doesn't recommend combining RCTs and observational studies in the same systematic reviews that is one of the major limitations of your study. However, it is worth reporting this study considering the implications of the outcomes on clinical practice.	Thank you for your suggestion. We agree with you in this regard.

8	Please also mention whether there was an intention for quantitative synthesis from the study in the methods section, and if not performed, the reason for the same (especially because this appears to be an intervention review).	An intention for quantitative analysis was there on our part. However, the included studies were heterogenous in design, drugs and outcomes and hence a quantitative analysis could not be performed.
Results		
9	It's worth mentioning the number of cases in each RCTs in table 1 to give readers the statistical power of the outcome measures.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have added the necessary information (pages 24-27).
10	It would be ideal to combine the effects of intervention on NAFLD in a single table (ALT, AST & GGT changes) rather than putting them separately in different tables. Again, the metabolic parameters may also be combined in to a single table (if possible)	We would like to combine the parameters in a single table but the size of the table will be large and it crosses the journal limit. Hence we have not combined the various parameters in a single table.
11	The results section should be shortened by reducing the bulk of details about secondary outcomes such as	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made the necessary modifications (pages 9-11).

	metabolic and lipid parameters as these are not the main aim of your study.	
Discussion		
12	This section should also be shortened to focus mainly on NAFLD outcomes of the intervention and possible mechanisms (currently the discussion looks quite laborious and narrative) rather than detailed discussion on metabolic, body weight and BMI outcomes and side effects. Please also focus on the quality and quantity of evidence of the drug intervention on NAFLD as that is what is required for the scientific fraternity.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made the necessary modifications (pages 11-15).
13	It is also worth mentioning if these studies were pharma sponsored too.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have added the information on sponsors (page 15).
Conclusions		
14	You have to weaken the claims in this section as it sounds like these class of drugs are remedies for NAFLD based on the review (that even based on low quality evidence.!).	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made the necessary corrections (page 15).

References		
15	This section may need modification while making the revision avoiding unwanted ones.	Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have made the necessary corrections (pages 16-22).