

We thank the Editor and reviewers for their valuable observations and for helping us improving the paper. We hope we have managed to improve it satisfactorily.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: In this manuscript the authors report Screening and interventions to prevent NAFLD/NASH-associated hepatocellular carcinoma The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The Introduction is well resourced and the subject is presented very well. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. The abstract is compatible with the main text. The keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript.

We thank the reviewer for these comments.

The authors should add histological figures illustrating the complications of celiac disease

We thank the reviewer for the comments. However, we think that there must be some editing mistake – as our manuscript does not refer to the celiac disease. We have added a second figure.

The references are up-to-date. This manuscript is well-balanced.

We thank the reviewer for these comments.

The style, language and grammar require minor revision

We have revised the manuscript and further polished the language. Also, a English language professional has proofread the manuscript.

This manuscript does not add anything new to the medical literature.

We did our best to bring up-to-date information to the suggested title (as per invitation). As per Editor-in-chief's suggestion, we have performed further literature research by using the RCA system, and added latest cutting-edge research results. We have reviewed and included data from 245 papers from the current literature, bringing most important and relevant information in this paper. We hope that the reviewer find the paper improved.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Thanks for the opportunity to review the REVIEW entitled "Screening and interventions to prevent NAFLD/NASH-associated hepatocellular carcinoma". The authors comprehensively concluded an overview of evidence related to lifestyle changes (i.e. weight loss, physical exercise, adherence to healthy dietary patterns, intake of certain dietary components, etc.) and

pharmacological interventions that might play a protective role by targeting the underlying causative factors and pathogenetic mechanisms. This is a well-written review with a clear message. It deserves to be published.

We thank the reviewer for these comments and appreciate the positive feedback.

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, 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. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure (medical imaging) to the manuscript. There are no restrictions on the figures (color, B/W). 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/>.

We thank the Editor-in-Chief for evaluating our manuscript and the opportunity to improve our paper. We have used the RCA database, as suggested by the Editor-in-chief, and we have identified several recent, significant articles that were added to our manuscript. We hope that this makes our paper more acceptable.

Our manuscript already contained a figure and a table (end of text). However, we have followed the Editor-in-chief's recommendation and have added a second figure to the paper.

The manuscript had been extensively revised and proofread by an authorized PROFEX English language professional.