

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your thorough review and insightful comments on our meta-analysis regarding the utility of the neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) in predicting mortality in patients with end-stage liver disease (ESLD). Please find below our responses to each of your comments:

We acknowledge the importance of establishing a cut-off value for NLR in ESLD patients and appreciate the reference to PMID: 32953712. However, based on the including study, the NLR cutoff value shows significant variation, thus precluding a definitive determination of a specific threshold such as 3 or 5. Additionally, due to factors including sample size and statistical methodology, it is meaningless to compute the mean NLR in the meta-analysis.

Your comment regarding the potential impact of NLR on liver transplantation practices is valid. But We feel sorry that the articles we included all end in death, making it difficult to elucidate the application of NLR in predicting liver transplantation outcomes.

We recognize that variations in neutrophil counts can indeed influence the NLR and potentially affect its utility in ESLD. This is a significant point, and we have added a section to our discussion addressing the implications of neutrophil variation on the NLR's predictive value.

We appreciate the suggestion to discuss other inflammatory markers such as the platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR) or the prognostic nutritional index (PNI). While our focus was on NLR, We have expanded our discussion to briefly touch upon these other markers,

Thank you for pointing out the inconsistency with figure numbering. We have carefully reviewed the document and corrected the figure numbers to ensure they are sequential and correspond correctly with the text.

Lastly, we have re-evaluated the forest plot's X-axis scale as per your feedback. We agree that clarity could be improved with more conventional numeric scaling. The forest plot has been adjusted to feature a scale of 0.5, 0.75, 1.0, 1.25, etc., to better represent the significance of the HR value of 1.07.

We hope these responses and the resulting revisions have addressed your concerns satisfactorily. We once again thank you for your constructive feedback, which has undoubtedly strengthened the paper. Should there be any further points you wish us to address, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Xinhua Li

The Third Affiliated Hospital of Sun Yat-sen University