

Response to Reviewers

Name of Journal: World Journal of Hepatology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 24984

Manuscript Type: Basic Study

Title: Screening the Potential Role of Killer Immunoglobulin Receptors Genes among Individuals Vaccinated against Hepatitis B Virus in Lebanon

Nada M Melhem et al.

Comments to authors: A good manuscript on an interesting subject: Please consider the followings:

Comment 1: The abstract is insufficient; it needs some details and need a clear conclusion.

Response: The abstract was modified to address the reviewer's concern. The methods, results and conclusion were elaborated to address this comment.

Comment 2: The English of the manuscript needs revision. There are numerous grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript; e.g., This study aims to explore the role of killer immunoglobulin/ the A haplotypes was detected...

Response: The author addressed the reviewer's concern and made the necessary corrections across the manuscript.

Comment 3: Abbreviations list is needed.

Response: While an abbreviation list is not required by the journal, the author made sure to define the acronyms when used for the first time across the manuscript as per the comment inserted within the manuscript.

Comment 4: The aim of the study is not clear; more details are needed about the rationale of the study.

Response: The aim of the study was elaborated as per the reviewer's comment in the last part of the introduction (pages 8-9). The author added the recent literature linking immune responses following vaccination with genetic factors and linked the rationale of the study to existing evidence.

Comment 5: The sample size is too small to suggest generalizable results

Response: We concur with the reviewer regarding the sample size of our study. The limitations and its impact on the results are discussed accordingly at the end of the discussion (page 20).

Comment 6: The results and tables are good.

Response: Nothing to address here as per the reviewer's comment.

Comment 7: The Discussion is short and it lacks focus. The authors should concentrate on interpretation of their findings and their relevance to the field of study. The discussion should be used for the interpretation of data and for pointing out the significance of the findings.

Response: We modified the discussion to reflect the interpretation of the findings as per this comment (the newly added interpretation as well as the significance of the findings are underlined in the discussion).

Comment 8: The conclusion must be added separately

Response: The author added concluding remarks on page 20.

