

Point-by-Point Responses to the Reviewers' Comments

REVIEWER 1:

Comments:

The review article is well written. It well summarized the recent findings of the important roles of NK cells in each phase of HCV infection. The article also tried to discuss the challenges and potential solutions in research on NK cells in HCV infection. There are only couple minor points to be conveyed to the authors based on the reviewer's personal experience/interests:

1) IL28B is a very important predictor for interferon-based HCV treatment response. Literature papers seemed to imply direct/indirect/independent interaction between IL28 and NK cells. A discussion in this review paper dedicating to this field might be interesting.

As suggested by the reviewer, we have added a discussion on *IL-28B* genotype and NK cells on the page 15 (line 28) and page 16 (lines 1-5) of the revised manuscript.

2) HIV/HCV co-infection is a complicate/challenging situation in this field. It also might be interesting to discuss the roles of NK cells in this situation.

Thank you for reminding us of HIV/HCV coinfection. We have included a new section describing the roles of NK cells in HIV/HCV coinfection on the page 13 of the revised manuscript. In addition, we have added sentences on the NK cells as a predictor of the treatment outcome in HCV/HIV coinfection on the page 16 (lines 10-12) of the revised manuscript.

REVIEWER 2:

Comments:

The article concerned is well-prepared. The latest literature have been well reviewed. An important point is that the 110th article in the references section has not been indicated inside the article. This point is better rechecked.

Thank you for pointing out the mistake. We have cited the article written by Wang JM, et al. in the main text as a reference #90 on the page 13 (line 22) of the revised manuscript.