

We thank the editors and the reviewers for their comments. We have prepared a pointwise response to the comments by editors and reviewers and highlighted the changes in the revised manuscript.

Science editor comments: Advantages and disadvantages: The reviewer has given positive peer-review reports for the manuscript. Scientific Classification: Grade B; Language Quality: Grade A. Suggest a reconsideration of its classification and reference count. In my view, it seems more appropriately categorized as a rapid or mini-review, rather than an editorial.

Reply: We will be delighted if our manuscript is accepted as a mini-review instead of an invited editorial.

Please add the author's contribution section.

Reply: Author's contribution section has now been added.

Please add the Core tip section.

Reply: Core tip section has now been added.

Please provide the PubMed numbers (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>) to the reference list and list all authors of the references.

Reply: Pubmed numbers have been added to all references.

Please provide the filled conflict-of-interest disclosure form.

Reply: Filled conflict-of-interest form has now been provided.

The article which this editorial discussed has not been listed in the references list. Please add the article which this editorial discussed into the main text and references list. [Vargas M, Cardoso Toniasso SC, Riedel PG, Baldin CP, dos Reis FL, Pereira RM, Brum MCB, Joveleviths D, Alvares-da-Silva MR. Metabolic disease and the liver: A review. World J Hepatol 2024; 16(1): 33-40 DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4254/wjh.v16.i1.33>]

Reply: The article by Vargas et al is listed in the reference list (reference number 25).

Reviewer's comment:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

The manuscript is both timely and well-composed. However, I would like to suggest a reconsideration of its classification and reference count. In my view, it seems more appropriately categorized as a rapid or mini-review, rather than an editorial, especially given its extensive list of 59 references and 3600+ words.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the encouraging comments. We will be delighted if the editors decide to accept our manuscript as a rapid or mini-review.