

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The present review is main about the NAFLD and COVID-19. It is generally well written. I have the following comments:

AUTHORS RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for the overall positive feedback and the specific points mentioned. We have tried to address them on the manuscript and here explaining whether relevant information is currently available or to address the lack of information in the manuscript adding a new paragraph under the future perspectives in the previously existing conclusion section. We have added references 77 and 78 as the closer to the suggested by the reviewer interesting points for consideration. We believe that at the current stage the manuscript is improved and addresses these gaps in the literature. In particular:

1. Up to today, the COVID-19 has experienced several variants; and most infected patients are asymptomatic, does any previous articles giving some information about different clinical results when NAFLD suffered different variant?

AUTHORS RESPONSE: This is indeed a fair point however we did not come across any relevant published literature, and we address this in the future perspectives section for future research

2. In fact, many NAFLD patients are lean, so what about the lean NAFLD compared the obese ones when got COVID-19?

AUTHORS RESPONSE: Another interesting point which however is beyond the focus of the current manuscript focusing on obesity, however we address this point at the future perspectives section and have added relevant reference.

3. We know that NAFLD include simple liver steatosis, NASH, liver fibrosis, even liver cancer, so what about the baseline liver condition of those who got a bad clinical end?

AUTHORS RESPONSE: This is a fair point and not very clear indeed and we now have addressed that in the future perspectives section

4. I suggest the authors use NAFLD through out the manu instead of fatty liver disease in some places.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: We agree, and we have changed the term for consistency

5. there are still type error in the manu.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: We apologize for the typographical errors, and we have now corrected them

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The review of the topic is complete and well-structured. The text may be useful as a general source of information or also as an update for Gastroenterologists. The manuscript is well written. Just a typographical error found in the abstract in the word "pre-exiting".

AUTHORS RESPONSE: We would like to thank the reviewer for the very positive feedback on our manuscript. The typographical error mentioned, and others were checked and revised.

6 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

AUTHORS RESPONSE: We would like to thank the editors for the very positive feedback on our manuscript. We created the appropriate PPT file with the figure. We also added two references in order to address the issues raised by the reviewers.