

Dear Dr. Editor Wang
Editor, World Journal of Gastroenterology

We do appreciate for your instruction and advices, which let us to view our submitted manuscript more carefully. We think the three reviewers' comments are very important. We have revised our manuscript in some places accordingly (**The changed content has been labeled by red color**). Followings are answers with some important discussions for a clear understanding.

List of changes made to the first reviewer's comments

Original question

In the section abstract the acronym Nk should be clarified. English language should be improved (an example "In the era of HCV treatment by pegylated-interferon (PEG-IFN)/ribavirin (RBV), the sustained virological response (SVR) rate is different according to HCV genotype: „," it is better was different (is the past). Could the authors explain who were the healthy subjects? Declaration of Helsinki is Helsinki Table 1 Demographic and clinical characteristics of chronic hepatitis C patients. Demographic?? Could the authors report in the text the features of treated disease, in particular the severity of liver fibrosis? Regarding NK features, are there differences at baseline among experienced and naive patients?

Corresponding answers for question

1. The acronym NK has been clarified.
2. "HCV genotype" has been changed as "HCV genotypes", "genotype ^[1]" has been changed as "genotype 1"
3. Healthy controls: on the basis of "no signs and evidences of HAV, HBV, HDV, HEV and HIV infection", the healthy controls were not infected with HCV.
4. "Helsinki" has been changed as "Helsinki".
5. "Demographic" has been changed as "Demographical".
6. In Table 1, I have showed the "Fibroscan Index" of every patient.
7. There were no differences of NK features between experienced and naive patients. (Figure 7)

List of changes made to the second reviewer's comments

Original question

Dear authors Based on my evaluation of your project, it is an interesting one which tries to address the effects of DAAs on the immune system. We need more studies like this with more sample size and investigation of more HCV treatment regimens. The manuscript is well-written and there is no need for language editing. I have no comments on this project. Best, Reviewer

List of changes made to the third reviewer's comments

Original question

1. **TITLE**

It needs to be written in more plausible form

Corresponding answers for question

The title of the paper has been changed as “Recovery of natural killer cells is mainly on post-treatment period in chronic hepatitis C patients treated with sofosbuvir plus ledipasvir”

2. ABSTRACT

It fulfills the journal requirements.

3. INTRODUCTION

It provides sufficient background regarding the studied topic

4. MATERIALS AND METHODS

It was nearly covered, where some important issues have to be considered.

- Small sample size
- Study cohort: non HCV viral coinfections were excluded by negative signs only. What about the laboratory investigations.
- Lymphocyte Isolation: The proper reference has to be cited.

Corresponding answers for question

- (1) Small sample size is a limitation of my manuscript. We will continue our study in a large population.
- (2) The related laboratory investigation about HAV, HBV, HDV, HEV and HIV were all negative. The sentences has been changed as “Patients had no signs and evidences of coinfection with HAV, HBV, HDV, HEV and HIV.”
- (3) The reference about “Lymphocyte Isolation” has been added. The reference is [17].

5. RESULTS

Are well presented and informative, however, the following remarks are better to be considered:

- Paragraph (1): *P value* has to be mentioned at the end of the paragraph
- Figures were informative, but better to be larger for clarification
- Table (1): The following have to be considered:
 - ✓ Title has to be revised “**Demographic not Democratic**”
 - ✓ On treatment basis, it is better to divide patients into naive vs. experienced patients
 - ✓ Normal values have to be mentioned regarding ALT/AST
 - ✓ Patient’s no. is better to be in order

Corresponding answers for question

- (1) *P value* has been added at the end of the paragraph. “...a significant reduction in liver inflammation as demonstrated by a decrease in ALT ($P = 0.007$) and AST levels ($P = 0.015$)”
- (2) Original figures have been changed for larger figures.
- (3) ① “Democratic” has been changed as “Demographic” in the title of the table.

② Patients in the Table 1 has been divided into naïve and experienced patients. The first 7 patients are naïve patients, the second 6 patients are experienced patients.

③ Normal values of ALT/AST (Week-2) have been added in Table 1

④ Patient's no. has been deleted.

6. Discussion

An overall theoretical analysis of the study results is nearly covered; however the conclusion included data about HBV/HCV coinfecting patients. This has to be revised and deleted as the study does not include HBV/HCV coinfection

Corresponding answers for question

The content about HBV/HCV coinfecting patients in the conclusion has been deleted.

7. References

- Relevant updated references are cited.
- PMID is maintained for all included references.
- The journal style for writing this section is maintained.

We hope you will find our revised manuscript acceptable for publication. If you still have some questions on revision, please contact us without any hesitation.

Thank you again and Best wishes

Yours Sincerely

Xiao-xiao Wang, Bo Feng