

Dear Sir or Madam,

we thank the reviewers for their remarks and you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript.

Below, you will find our answers to all remarks of the reviewers:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. At the beginning of the introduction, start with the study group, the dependent variables, and finally, the independent variables are explained. There should be content coherence between paragraphs, and they should be linked like links. The research background should be such that the research gap and unanswered questions are identified for the reader. At least in the last paragraph, state the unresolved issues and research gaps and direct and indirect applications of this study. It is important to note how the results of this study can help resolve ambiguities.

Our manuscript is a review of the current literature. We therefore do not understand, what the reviewer wants to express with these nonspecific remarks referring to a “study group”, and “dependent and independent variables” which do not exist in this manuscript. We think, that these remarks are only partly applicable to our manuscript. Nevertheless we have addressed all specific aspects that are related to the manuscript as such.

2. To express the purpose, problem statement, the definition of specialized terms or scientific abbreviations, information provided in other similar research, the necessity of research and research innovation compared to previous research, unanswered questions that this research answers, and explain how the results of this study can help resolve ambiguities.

See above, not applicable.

3. In the article's introduction, two questions should be answered briefly: Does the paper address an important issue? Has this research question been raised before?

Per definition (special issue, invited review), the manuscript addresses an important issue, there is no original research in this manuscript.

4. Please state the ethical considerations of the research.

See above, not applicable. There is no original research in this manuscript.

5. Sampling needs further explanation and clarification.

See above, not applicable. There is no sampling in this manuscript.

6. Materials and methods is unclear.

See above. This is not a “study” manuscript. We have, however, added a statement describing the literature search of the review (page 4).

7. In the Discussion, a summary of the findings is mentioned, and their interpretation is described. The alignment and non-alignment of the findings with the findings of previous similar researches are compared and examined and explained, the result then practical overview and generalizability of the results and in general, what has been added from this research to the existing theoretical and applied knowledge, has been written and in line with it, has expressed the limitations of the study and provided analysis and used suggestions for future studies.

See above. Not applicable.

8. In the Limitations section point out the factors that have restricted your research's internal and external credibility state the methodological limitations. Make research suggestions based on these limitations and write practical recommendations based on the findings. Avoid making general suggestions such as holding and explaining what the findings are based on the results of the hypothesis.

See above. Not applicable.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. Congratulations to the authors for the study. I have very little to add.

Thank you for your commendation.

2. I think it is pertinent to insert the meaning of the acronyms before their insertion.

We checked all acronyms and inserted the meaning in several cases (pages 3, 4, 6 and 13). Additionally, abbreviations in the table were explained in the legend.

3. Additionally, I suggest some figure that summarizes the relationship proposed in the review.

There is a figure included that summarizes exactly these relationship. However, we might have missed to make clear that these mechanisms also concern NAFLD. We therefore now inserted a clarifying text in the figure legend.

4. Although relevant information has been included in the table, its layout is not pretty.

This table is the first to summarize all clinical studies regarding the effect of the presence of NAFLD or NASH on the clinical course of COVID-19. In order to improve the layout, we emphasized the central properties of each study by using bold letters. Positive properties in the study design were colored green, negative properties were colored red. These changes should contribute to the dissemination and citation of the table.

5. These considerations, however, are up to the authors to decide whether or not to comply. They will only increase the chance of citation of the study.

Thank you again for your remarks. We think that this manuscript will have an important role in the scientific field since it is the first to summarize all clinical studies regarding the interplay of these two important diseases and discuss the molecular mechanisms that unify COVID-19 and NAFLD.

Additional points:

We added ref. 78. The EASL has just published an updated position paper in October 2022.

On page 5, we noticed a missing “y” and corrected “the” to “they”.

Since there was only one little change of the manuscript text itself (page 4), we upload the known language certificate and did not apply for a new one.

Thank you very much again,

Best regards,

Christoph G. Dietrich