

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Many thanks to the editor and the reviewers for the opportunity to revise our manuscript and the continued constructive comments, entitled “**Influence of NAFLD on Response to Antiviral Treatment in Patients with Chronic Hepatitis B: A Meta-Analysis**” (Manuscript NO.: 89218, Meta-Analysis). We have studied the comments carefully and have made revisions that we hope will meet with your approval. The revised portion and all the changes are highlighted in the revised version of the manuscript. The main revisions and the point-by-point responses to the editor’s comments are as follows.

Responds to reviewers' comments:

Reviewer#1

Comments 1: The result section of the abstract is too poor: no data have been reported. Furthermore, herein Authors described a result that is the opposite of what reported in the main text. The same applies to what written in the discussion.

Response: We sincerely appreciate this valuable comment and have made modifications according to your suggestions. We have revised the abstract, result and discussion according to your suggestions. Now expressed as “Biochemical response until 48 week (OR = 0.87, 95%CI 0.50–1.53, $P = 0.000$) and 96 week (OR = 0.35, 95%CI 0.24–0.53, $P = 0.24$) and virological response until 96 week (OR = 0.80, 95%CI 0.43–1.49, $P = 0.097$) were lower in patients with hepatic steatosis than in patients with CHB alone”.

Comments 2: The literature search is not updated (February 2023).

Response: Thank you for your constructive feedback; The literature search has been updated (October 2023). But no new search included.

Comments 3: PRISMA guidelines for meta-analysis have not been followed nor cited in the paper.

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We have added and cited PRISMA guidelines. Now expressed as “This study was conducted and reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses statement^[7] and in accordance with the meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology guidelines for the meta-analysis of observational studies” at the beginning of materials and methods.

Comments 4: The NOS scale should refer to a reference.

Response: Thank you for your careful advice; We added NOS scale in *Data Extraction and Quality assessment*.

Comments 5: Paragraph 2.3: “significant heterogeneity” should be better defined. Moreover, in paragraph 3.3, I² was 75%, and this is a relevant heterogeneity, contrarily to what stated.

Response: Thank you for your constructive feedback; Now expressed as “A value of $\geq 75\%$ was considered indicative of substantial heterogeneity, ≥ 50 as moderate heterogeneity, $\geq 25\%$ as mild heterogeneity, and $< 25\%$ as the absence of heterogeneity” in *Statistical Analysis*. And “Substantial heterogeneity was noted ($I^2 = 75.6\%$, $P = 0.000$), and the random effects model was applied” in *Virological Responses*.

Comments 6: The table is not readable.

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. New Table has submitted.

Comments 7: Paragraph 3.6: it is unclear how NAFLD impacted on antiviral effectiveness according to the type of treatment.

Response: Thank you for your careful advice; There result is “The results indicated that when patients were treated with IFNs or NAs, those with CHB and hepatic steatosis did not exhibit any significant difference from those with only CHB”.

Comments 8: Is there any data discriminating the result between NAFLD and NASH?

Response: Thank you for your constructive feedback; However, the degree of hepatic steatosis was unclear in most studies, with no reference to NASH. We acknowledge that the significant effect of hepatic steatosis on the therapeutic response in patients with CHB should be demonstrated through larger studies that definite the degree of hepatic steatosis.

Reviewer#2

Comments : Erol designed study, food work

Response: Many thanks to the reviewer for the comment, this Meta-Analysis not designed study, food work.

Thank you and all reviewers for the kind advice again. Your comments have guided us in improving our paper, and we are grateful for the learning opportunity you have given us. We have tried our best to improve the manuscript and provided some explanations. We hope that you feel our responses satisfactory. If you have any questions, please contact us without hesitate.

Yours sincerely,

shi yi liu, dian wang, Jing Liu, luping yang, Gong-Ying Chen