

20/08/2022

Re: Manuscript Number: ID

Title: **Hepatic involvement in children with acute bronchiolitis**

Dear Respected Editors and reviewers

Good day

Thank you very much for the comprehensive review and the precious time you spent reviewing this study. We accepted all the comments of the expert reviewers. We made the advised changes and answered the queries. All the changes were marked in red for easy tracking by the reviewer. The manuscript looks much better with these changes, and we tried to improve the language we could and checked by a native speaker reviewer and certificate is attached. Thank you again for your precious assistance.

Here we are replying point by point:

**Reviewer 1:**

	Reviewer Comments	Authors reply
Reviewer #1	The title of the figures must have the same scheme.	The titles of the figures were corrected.
	Then the topic is current, and it is a good review with a good search methodology. I approve the review.	Thank you
Reviewer #2	The overall manuscript is coherent and well-organized.	Thank you for your comments.
	The result part needed to be corrected with the method, so there weren't any results, and the flowchart also needed to be moved to the method part.	The correction was done. The result section was removed, and the results of our analysis of the four central studies concerned with the percentage of clinical data were shown in Table 1 as a part of the discussion.
	The tables are well, but the figures, especially the third one, could be of better quality and make readers understand the idea behind them.	Thank you Figures were revised, and figure three was updated.
	The conclusion is also not supported and needs to rewrite, and add the whole concept	The conclusion was rewritten according to the reviewer's instructions.

	with a more robust description.	
	Generally, the title and notion of this manuscript are good, and the tables are acceptable.	Thank you
	Still, how this article is written could be more supportive and attractive to readers, and significant changes are required to meet the criteria for publication.	As the reviewer suggested, we modified the article to be more supportive and attractive.

**Reviewer respond**

- 1 The introduction has been shortened and the language reorganised.
- 2 the core tip is adequate.
- 3 The article's discussion section is supportive.
- 4 References I quote some new ones.