

Response to Reviewers

We would like to thank the editor and reviewers for providing us with feedback and comments. We have revised the manuscript according to those comments and hoped that the revised manuscript has met the criteria for publication. We provided point-by-point responses to reviewers below. Changes were highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript file.

Reviewer 1

The paper make a review for cholestatic injury when COVID-19 infection. In title: Cholestatic liver injury: A rare but fatal complication during and after COVID-19 infection. This is a interesting issue, talking about the mechanism from viral infection ,ischemic injury , drug induce hepatitis, change of gut micromiota and cytokine releasing syndrome. Authors did a delicate review.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. My purpose for this study is to add a brief review of this condition which may not be documented considerably in the past. To strengthen the quality of the manuscript, we have revised some content according to the comments from Reviewer 2.

Reviewer 2

This is an important study in an under-researched area of the world. The manuscript is written and will serve a broad audience of students, researchers, and practitioners. However, unfortunately, there are a considerable number of major flaws in this study, which seriously diminish the validity of the work, as noted below:

- The article as it is constructed looks more like a reflection than a review. The main and fundamental purpose of writing a review is to create a readable synthesis of the best resources available in the literature for an important research question or a current area of research. Given the approach to a narrative/integrative review it seems to me important to provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes (e.g., PICO acronym).

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. My purpose for this study is to add a brief review of this condition which may not be documented considerably in the past. Therefore, this mini-review may only serve as a hypothesis-generation of all relevant articles existing in the literature. I've edited the "Methods" section in the manuscript to add more details regarding the study design and the purpose of this study (Page 5, Line 22-23 and Page 6, Line 1-7).

- Discuss retrieval of references and handling, including inclusion and exclusion criteria (i.e., how the analysis was conducted, including judgment of quality of papers included in the literature review). I suggest a better explanation of the criteria for inclusion/exclusion (e.g. PICO method) used in the selection of the studies analyzed. It would be important to define whether this sample resulted in a basic research/ individual from each descriptor or is an advanced search and resulted therefore the intersection of different descriptors (e.g. Boolean method). Present full electronic search strategy, such that it could be repeated. Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow PRISMA diagram (in a supplementary file, for a better analysis).

Answer: Thank you for pointing out this issue. I understand the way the reviewer suggested; however, this mini-review serves as a brief summary of the condition that may have not been discussed or documented. As a result, the study flow or PRISMA diagram which is used for illustrating the overall picture of included articles in the systematic review may not be presented. However, I've widened the search strategy and documented the full electronic search strategy, and presented it in supplementary data. I've edited the "Methods" section in the manuscript (Page 5, Line 22-23 and Page 6, Line 1-7, and supplementary data).

- The search strategies may not be sufficient and may be overly simple. It is useful to include keywords, but you don't mention the Mesh terms.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. I've edited the "Methods" section to include more details regarding the search terms and search strategy in the revised manuscript (Page 5, Line 22-23 and Page 6, Line 1-7).

- PubMed is not a database...but a search engine... Medline is... Have you considered to include ISI web of science?

Answer: Thank you for raising this point. I agreed with the reviewer and made an additional search on the other databases, including PubMed, Medline, Web of Science, and Reference Citation Analysis. I've edited the "Methods" section in the revised manuscript (Page 5, Line 22-23 and Page 6, Line 1-7).

- Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigator.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. Since my purpose for this study is to add a brief review of this condition which may not be documented considerably in the past, the data extraction, data processing, and assessment of the quality of each study were not included in our process in this study. I appreciate this point from the reviewer and look forward to conducting that type of study in the future.

- Implications for practice and research need addressed in more deep.

Answer: Thank you for giving this valuable point. I've added the subheading "Clinical implication" in the revised manuscript to describe more details about the implications for clinical practice and my insight towards this study and the research opportunities in the future (Page 12, Line 20-23 and Page 13, Line 1-10).

- Lastly, the abstract does not adequately reflect the methodology used in the development of the review. Must be reviewed.

Answer: Thank you for this point. I've revised the abstract to include the methodology used in this mini-review (Page 2, Line 4-7).