

Authors' Point by Point Review

We would like to thank the editors and reviewers for their excellent comments and feel that the paper is now stronger as a result. We have addressed all the questions raised to the best of our abilities below.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: First, this manuscript is a review paper which has not any original findings or new hypotheses. Second, the manuscript was well written with high quality and importance. However, the tables 1 to table 4 were not well arranged. Single table had better is showed in single page. Figure legends and figure was not separated. Positive findings in figure were not showed with arrows.

We acknowledge this invited review article does not provide original findings. However, it is the first review on this topic published in the World Journal collection. The field of immunotherapy is rapidly evolving. Therefore, previously published review articles on this topic may be outdated. We have included the latest literature in our review with many references in the last 2-3 years, thus providing a more up-to-date review than other published articles.

We have now rearranged tables 1-4 to be together in a single document rather than dispersed throughout the manuscript.

We have now separated Figure legends and figures. Positive findings on the figures are now shown with arrows.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Congratulations for selecting an excellent topic and writing it very well.

Thank you very much for your kind comments

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: This is a review article about Immune checkpoint inhibitor-related hepatotoxicity. This topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade B (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: One reviewer requested the adjustment of a table and the second reviewer made no relevant comments for this review. (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 2 figures (4) References: A total of 91 references are cited, including 26 references published in the last 3 years; 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found by the Google/Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. 5 Comments by Academic Editor: 1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure files. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; 2) Tables must be sent separately. At the end of the article, there should be a topic "tables and figures Legends" 3) There are several title articles published with the same title. Please rate the title change including the final "A review" . 6 Re-Review: Required 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

We have now provided the original pictures in a Powerpoint file with arrows.

We have also provided the tables in a separate word file.
We have added the Table and Figure Legends section at the end of the manuscript.
We have changed the title of our article to "Immune checkpoint inhibitor-related hepatotoxicity: a review" as suggested by the editor.
Thank you very much for your kind consideration

(2) *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.

Thank you very much for your kind consideration