

Answering Reviewers

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments on our manuscript entitled "Hepatitis B virus infection in patients with Wilson disease: a large retrospective study" (NO: 86017). These comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance for our research. We have carefully studied the comments and made corrections that we hope will meet with approval. The revised parts are marked in yellow in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewer's comments are as follows:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Title: Hepatitis B virus infection in patients with Wilson disease: a large retrospective study Manuscript ID: 86017 Clinical Trials Study Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology Reviewer Comments: The findings of the current study revealed the prevalence and clinical impact of HBV infection in patients with WD. Study findings indicate that the prevalence of HBV infection stratified by sex and age in patients with WD is similar to that in the general population. The diagnosis of WD in CHB patients is usually missed. HBV infection is an independent risk factor for severe liver disease in WD patients. The diagnosis of WD should be ruled out in some patients with CHB infection. Overall, the article is informative and well written, and easy to understand. I would suggest this manuscript be published in your Journal.

Authors: Thank you for your comments, in the part of Reviewer #1 there were no issues we need to correct.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Authors: Thanks to your suggestions, the writing has been improved. We have discussed the writing problems with a professional English supervisor, he gave us several suggestions, all of which have been adopted and adjusted in the manuscript accordingly.

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: (1) The manuscript's overall structure is complete and contains a title, abstract, keywords, core tip, introduction, case presentation and results, discussion, acknowledgments, and references. (2) The scientific question emphasizes HBV infection's prevalence and clinical impact on Wilson disease (WD). This is presented in the introduction section, along with the relevant background, rationale, aim, significant findings, and potential significance of the study. Therefore, this section is suitable to attract readers' attention. (3) The methods and techniques adopted in the paper are presented in the Methods section. Besides, the manuscript provides adequate details of methods to allow a reader to repeat the research. (4) The data source is reliable and indicated by the information presented in the study. (5) The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. The results and their applicability/relevance to the literature are stated clearly. (6) The discussion accurately presents the study's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice.

(7) The conclusion of the case presentation is presented. This section should be ameliorated to inform the readers briefly about the contributions of the data to the field. Besides, the future research directions should be given in detail.

(8) The manuscript cites all critical, relevant, and timely references. (9) There is no indication of academic misconduct in the study. (10) The manuscript

contributes to understanding the presence of WD in patients with CHB. Besides, it highlights the importance of HBV infection as a significant risk factor for severe liver injury in patients with WD. (11) The manuscript describes an essential direction of research. (12) The title of the manuscript does not contain grammatical errors. (13) The manuscript falls within the scope of WJG (14) The language of the paper needs to reach the standard of publishing, and minor revisions are required. Peer-reviewer's Conclusion: The manuscript falls within the scope of WJG. The experiences and lessons presented in the manuscript improve the readers' practice. The content of the manuscript has value for publication.

Authors: in the reviewer #2 part, the issue we need to reply is “ (7) The conclusion of the case presentation is presented.”

Thank you for pointing out this problem in the manuscript. In the conclusion section, we have corrected and mentioned the contributions of the data to the field and given the future research directions.

The responds to editorial office's comments

Company editor-in-chief:

#1 Please authors are required to provide standard three-line tables,.....

Authors: Thank you, we have modified three-line tables according to requirements.

#2 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.....

Authors: Thank you for your suggestions. At present, correlational research in this area is very limited, there are no recent cutting-edge references to add.