Dear Prof. Ma,

Thank you very much for the conditional acceptance of our manuscript and the helpful comments. We have revised the manuscruipt using the "track changes" mode of Word.

Here, we reply to the comments:

Reviewer #1:

#### **Specific Comments to Authors:**

1. The title of the manuscript completely reflects its main subject

## No changes necessary

2. The abstract summarizes and reflects the described in the manuscript content

### No changes necessary

3. The key words are suitable

#### No changes necessary

4. 4-7: This manuscript is a review article, which is written according to the rules. The key points are clearly defining: who should be screen to NAFLD and how. The authors analyzed all pros and cons of screening for NAFLD, identified groups at particular risk of developing this disease, existing methods for assessing NAFLD, considering their availability, cost and effectiveness. The review has critical discussion on each item. The authors express their own position on the need for screening for NAFLD. The review analyzes the problem, but does not provide an unambiguous proposal for its solution.

Solutions for screening depend on individual situations of NAFLD epidemiology and health system structures in the respective countries. We emphasized that on page 18. These individual situations are also considered in the algorithm (figure 3).

5. The illustrations are good quality, understandable, illustrate content, have legends

# No changes necessary

6. Statistic is based on analysis of literature data and reliable sources

# No changes necessary

7. The manuscript meets the requirement use of SI units

### No changes necessary

8. The references sited correctly

### No changes necessary

9. The language, grammar and style are accurate and appropriate

### No changes necessary

10. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics. The presented review makes it possible to take the next steps to practically solve the problem of screening to NAFLD

# No changes necessary

#### Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes an opinion review of the screening for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade B;

### No changes necessary

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The title of the manuscript completely reflects its main subject. The abstract summarizes and reflects the described in the manuscript content. It is written according to the rules.

#### No changes necessary

(3) Format: There is 1 table and 3 figures.

# No changes necessary

(4) References: A total of 121 references are cited, including 45 references published in the last 3 years;

### No changes necessary

(5) Self-cited references: There are 6 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations that are closely related to the topic of the manuscript, and remove other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and

Self-citation is below 5 %, all self-citations are related to the topic and reflect the expertise of our group. We therefore did not change the references.

(6) References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the <a href="editorialoffice@wjgnet.com">editorialoffice@wjgnet.com</a>. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. A language editing certificate issued by AJE 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

### No changes necessary

Issues raised: (1) 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; and (2) Please obtain permission for the use of picture(s). 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.

All figures in the manuscript are original figures by the authors. There is no permission necessary. The figures have been resubmitted as Powerpoint files.

Thank you again for your efforts, we hope that our manuscript can now be finally accepted for publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Sincerely,

Christoph G. Dietrich, MD, PhD