

**Response to the Comments**

**Manuscript No:** 64953

**Manuscript Title:** Potential Role of Noninvasive Biomarkers in Liver Fibrosis

**Authors:** Navneet Kaur, Goyal Gitanjali, Ravinder Garg, Chaitanya Tapasvi, Sonia Chawla, Rajneet Kaur

Dear Editors and reviewers

Thank you for your useful comments and feedback on our paper which helped us to improve its presentation and quality. We have carefully addressed all of your comments in the revised manuscript. We hope that you will be satisfied with the response provided by us.

Sincerely,  
The authors.

x-----x

**Science editor comments:**

Scientific quality: This manuscript describes a review of non-invasive biomarkers for liver fibrosis. The topic is within the scope of the WJGO. It's an interesting topic. If a little note could be added about the specificity (sensitivity might be increased though) of these noninvasive markers even if not as specific as our present invasive confirmatory test. Also, what perfect combination of noninvasive markers measures close to our state-of-the-art invasive method of evaluation. The figures do not include any novel message or hypothesis. Furthermore, there is a variety of similar review for non-invasive biomarkers for liver fibrosis. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered.

**Response to comments:** The authors are thankful for the positive feedback. As suggested the paper has been thoroughly revised the paper as per reviewers comments and your suggestions before submission.

x-----x

**Company editor-in-chief comments:**

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 Hepatology, 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.

**Response to comments:** The authors are thankful for the positive feedback. As suggested the paper has been thoroughly revised the paper as per reviewers comments before submission.

x-----x

**Reviewer #1:**

**Specific Comments to Authors:**

The lower part of Table b in page 13 seems hidden. In Conclusion, This is a very good work and it is also well done. Although this is beyond the scope of this studies. I wanted to ask if a little note could be added about the specificity(sensitivity might be increased though) of these noninvasive markers even if not as specific as our present invasive confirmatory test. Also what perfect combination of noninvasive markers measures close to the our state of the art invasive method of evaluation.

**Response to comments:**The authors are thankful to the reviewer for the positive response. The response to the comments can be found immediately below the reviewer's comment.

**Comment 1:** The lower part of Table b in page 13 seems hidden.

**Response 1:** As suggested, the author have rechecked all the tables and updated them to remove the errors.

**Comment 2:**Although this is beyond the scope of this studies. I wanted to ask if a little note could be added about the specificity(sensitivity might be increased though) of these noninvasive markers even if not as specific as our present invasive confirmatory test.

**Response 2:** As suggested, we have added notes related to the specificity (sensitivity) for the non-invasive biomarkers alongside the discussion of each biomarker in the revised manuscript. Moreover, a separate table is also added to reflect this point (Table 4).

**Comment 3:**Also what perfect combination of noninvasive markers measures close to the our state of the art invasive method of evaluation.

**Response 3:** As suggested, we have added a discussion on the perfect combination of the non-invasive biomarkers in the conclusion section based on the literature.

X-----X

**Reviewer #2:**

**Specific Comments to Authors:**

This manuscript describes a review of non-invasive biomarkers for liver fibrosis. The title is very promising for recent progress in hepatology. However, the contents do not always show novel findings form original papers and cited papers are limited. The figures do not include any novel message or hypothesis. Furthermore, there is a variety of similar review for non-invasive biomarkers for liver fibrosis. Therefore, a reviewer thinks this manuscript should not be published in high-grade journals such as World Journal of Gastroenterology.

**Response to comments:**The authors are thankful to the reviewer for the positive response. The response to the comments can be found immediately below the reviewer's comment.

**Comment 1:**However, the contents do not always show novel findings form original papers and cited papers are limited.

**Response 1:** As suggested, we have added a separate section that highlights the novel findings and discussions on the potential role of non-invasive biomarkers from the original papers. We have also addressed the second suggestion of the reviewer and added more citations in the revised manuscript and the total number of references have now increased from 31 to 94.

**Comment 2:**The figures do not include any novel message or hypothesis.

**Response 2:**The figures added in the manuscript provide informative illustrations. Like, Fig. 1 shows the factors that promote liver disease and various stages of the liver disease progression. Fig. 2 provides a novel taxonomy of the methods of liver fibrosis assessment and this figure act as the basis of this entire review. Fig. 3 provides a step-by-step process related to the miRNA biogenesis. The figures are not added to provide any message or hypothesis but are for the knowledge of the reader regarding the different processes.

As suggested by the reviewer, we have added separate information regarding the novel message that is incurred from the review of literature. In this context, we have added a sub-section that highlights the novel findings from the existing literature that supports the importance of the non-invasive biomarkers. Also, we have added a section related to the pros and cons of non-invasive biomarkers in the end of the article.

**Comment 3:**Furthermore, there is a variety of similar review for non-invasive biomarkers for liver fibrosis.

**Response 3:**The authors agree that there are several other reviews related to the topic, but we have provided a different perspective of the problem covering all of the non-invasive biomarkers whereas the other reviews are focused on some of the specific categories only. Lie, most of the reviews cover a specific set of non-invasive biomarkers, but they have not considered miRNA. In this review we have considered all the possible set of non-invasive biomarkers along with miRNA. Moreover, we have provided an analysis of the non-invasive biomarkers on the basis of sensitivity and specificity. This makes this paper an end-to-end review of the potential biomarkers for assessing liver fibrosis.

X-----X

### **Reviewer #3:**

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

The manuscript was properly drafted

**Response to comments:**The authors are thankful for the positive feedback.