Dear Editors,

We sincerely thank the Editors and all Reviewers for their valuable feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have made extensive revisions to our manuscript. In this revised version, changes to our manuscript were all highlighted within the document by using red-colored text. Point-by-point responses to the nice associate editor and three nice reviewers are listed in blue below this letter.

Point-by-point response to Reviewers

## Reviewer 1:

it is a well-documented manuscript that will add more awareness in the literature toward the relationship between TG and GFR. However, there are two important comments that i want to add. firstly, I suggest to change the title and make it more easier to understand, such as change the word 'associated' to (conversely related) as this explain the title better. in addition, the BMI range more than 25 is better to use the word overweight instead of obese as it is more accurate

Thank you for your professional comments. We agree with the comment and re-wrote the title in the revised manuscript as the following: Dynamic Changes of Estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate are Conversely related to Triglyceride in Non-overweight Patients. As defined by the World Health Organization, it refers to overweight as having BMI greater than or equal to 25 and obesity as having BMI greater than or equal to 30, the "overweight" provides a more accurate description, We have modified this expression throughout the text according to the comment.

## Reviewer 2:

The title and abstract are well written Introduction covers the general information regarding the subject. Materials and methods section is well written Results section is well

written Discussion is sufficient References are up to date The study includes a total of 355 HBV-infected patients who received TDF treatment. The eGFR is dependent on base line eGFR and basal BMI of the patients I believe the study is didactic and subejcet has not been studied before

Our deepest gratitude goes to you for your careful work and positive evaluation of our work.

## Reviewer 3:

This paper that is based on statistical analysis is well written and gets to the point of the issue. As there are no real experimental methodologies to critique and the statistical analysis is sound, and the conclusions reasonable, it is acceptable for publication.

We really appreciate your efforts in giving your time and expertise to review our manuscript. Thank you for your precious evaluation .