

Reviewer					#1:
Scientific	Quality: Grade		B	(Very	good)
Language	Quality: Grade	B	(Minor	language	polishing)
Conclusion: Major					revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The paper reviewed is a thorough review of the immunological and rheumatological manifestations of viral hepatitis. It is well-written and the authors present the information in an orderly and concise fashion, and the figures and tables attached are appropriately illustrative of the paper content. I think the manuscript is of a good enough quality to be considered for publication, yet I recommend making the following changes: - Abstract - on the 4th line - which can manifest itself as glomerulonephritis, arthritis, uveitis, vasculitis – please delete the word itself. - Introduction – Last line on the bottom of the page “infection with hepatotropic viruses can manifest themselves only in the form of these disorders, leading to misdiagnosis and inadequate treatment” – the use of the word themselves is a grammatical error. Delete the word themselves. - Under the title Hepatitis A on page 4 Line 11 – correct “cryoglobulin” to cryoglobulin - Under the title Hepatitis C on page 8 – “Pain in the joints and/or muscles are noted in 70% of patients with chronic hepatitis C if anamnesis was conducted special to identify the same” - The sentence is not clear enough for potential readers. I suggest changing to “Pain in the joints and/or muscles are noted in 70% of patients with chronic hepatitis C if thorough anamnesis is conducted” - Under the title conclusion on page 13 – 3rd line “ which can manifest itself as glomerulonephritis” – delete the word “itself” - The title of table 4 is inappropriate. Would change to "A summary of the main immunological, rheumatologic and extrahepatic manifestation in Viral hepatitis" - Change the titles of tables 1 to " A summary of previously reported cases of vasculitis due to Hepatitis A infection ". Apply the same title change to table 3 as well " A summary of previously reported cases of arthritis with Hepatitis E infection" - The order of the conclusion is confusing and it fails to convey a clear message. Please re-write the conclusion paragraph to highlight the main points presented. I suggest starting the section by mentioning the wide array of extrahepatic manifestations potentially associated with hepatitis viruses and ending the section by emphasizing the need for future research such as testing the biomarkers of viral hepatitis in these diseases and the potential impact of anti-viral drugs on those extra-hepatic manifestations. - Lots of frequencies and percentages are presented in the various section of hepatitis viruses and although the data presented are rather important, the extensive use of them throughout the manuscript makes them difficult to follow for the average reader. I suggest cutting down the unnecessary ones (e.g frequencies of different types of GN in each hepatitis virus, a brief mention of the most common type followed by other types without percentages is enough in my opinion).

Authors' response:

Thanks for your comments. Your recommendations have been implemented.

Reviewer					#2:
Scientific	Quality: Grade		B	(Very	good)
Language	Quality: Grade	B	(Minor	language	polishing)
Conclusion: Accept					(General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the

manuscript? yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? It is a review. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? It is a review. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? yes 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? It is a review. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? It is a review. 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Appropriate references. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? The manuscript needs more organization. Style and language is appropriate. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? It is a review. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? It is a review. Please find the attached word file with tracking comments of my review.

Authors' response:

Thanks for your comments. Your recommendations have been implemented.

(1) *Science editor:* 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a review of the immune disorders and rheumatologic manifestations of viral hepatitis. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Two Grades B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The paper reviewed is a thorough review of the immunological and rheumatological manifestations of viral hepatitis. It is well-written and the authors present the information in an orderly and concise fashion, and the figures and tables attached are appropriately illustrative of the paper content. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 1 figure. A total of 123 references are cited, including 36 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Two Grades B. A language editing certificate issued by Editage was provided. 3 Academic

norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. 5 Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; (2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; (3) If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable; and (4) Authors should always cite references that are relevant to their study. Please check and remove any references that not relevant to this study. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Authors' response:

- 1) Author Contributions section has been added;
- 2) the original figure is presented in the PPT file;
- 3) we did not use non-original figures;
- 4) the list of references has been checked.

(3) Company editor-in-chief: 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.