

Author's Response to Reviewer #1:

First of all, we would like to thank the Reviewer for his / her positive evaluation of our work and for all the suggestions which helped us to improve the manuscript. Please find below our response to specific items mentioned by the Reviewer.

1. In page 2, the first section was entitled "Screening for HBsAg". This section mainly stating the current limitation and deficiency on just only screening for HBsAg for pregnant women. I think this title was not proper and may cause a logical confusion while reading the subsequent contents. So I suggest for a more concise title such as "Current limitation on screening for HBsAg in pregnant women."

Done. We totally agree that the title suggested by the Reviewer is more precise. Thank you!

2. In page 3, table 2: what does the numbers with a comma such as "9,4", "9,2", "7,9", "1,09", "0,63", "0,5" in the "HBsAg – positive" column mean? Does that mean "94", "92", "79", "109", "63", "5" ?

Done. Thanks a lot for a very careful reading! The numbers were written with a comma instead of a dot, that was our mistake. Moreover, we have forgotten to mention in the headline of the column that the numbers refer to the percentage of HBsAg-positive patients. We apologize for these mistakes.

3. In page 5, table 3: the title "Phase of CHB" was not integrated. This table mainly showed the clinical features in different phases of CHB and its relative vertical transmission risk. So I suggest that a more integrated title should be given to this table.

Done. We agree that the title of this table was not precise enough. Thank you for pointing this out! As suggested by the Reviewer, we changed the title to "*Clinical features and vertical transmission risk in different phases of CHB*" which reflects the contents of this table.

4. Some citations of reference paper were not standard, such as in page 6, line 17 “For example, in [39]”, page 6, line 19 “In the study reported in [40]”.

Done. Now, all the citations are done in the same standard way.

5. In page 7, line 4: the full name of the abbreviation “GDM” should be given when it first appeared.

Done. As this abbreviation does not appear elsewhere, we replaced it by the full name “gestational diabetes mellitus”. Thank you for pointing this out!