

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

REVIEWER #1

"The paper is well written and reflects an important finding, although already extensively described. The paper is too long, as well as the references, which became the paper less interesting as some times is too exhaustive."

- A major revision of the manuscript was conducted. The manuscript was substantially shortened from 9,341 to 6,047 word count (a 35.2% reduction).
- References list was also reduced from 478 to 329 citations (31.7% reduction).
- The number of citations within the text was significantly reduced.

REVIEWER #2

The review is written very thoroughly, the problem was comprehensively analyzed. However, sometimes the text is too extensive, overload by numbers and hard to percept. To improve the understanding and to simplify the perception, some findings and conclusions could be visualized - like schemes (the causes and mechanisms of liver injury development at the COVID-19 background), forest plots (correlations, prevalences, ORs etc), whatever the authors like - to minimize the text overload. Minor: page 5, the numbers of positive cells could be expressed per 10,000 - to simplify the comparisons

- A major revision of the manuscript was conducted. The manuscript was substantially shortened from 9,341 to 6,047 word count (a 35.2% reduction). Tables 1 and 2 were shortened by including only studies with more than 200 participants.
- Large numbers of citations within the text were also limited. References list was also reduced from 478 to 329 citations (31.7% reduction).
- Findings and conclusions were visualized. A very illustrative image of COVID-19-associated liver injury mechanisms named as Figure 1 was added. In addition, another two simple and illustrative graphs (Figure 2, 3) were added
- In page 5, the numbers of positive cells was expressed per 10,000 - to simplify the comparisons