

Dear editor,

We are grateful to you and to the reviewers for providing constructive feedback for our manuscript. We have addressed all the comments. Below we paste a point-by-point response. In case you feel that some of the comments have not been sufficiently addressed, we are willing to revise further.

Kind regards,

The authors

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** I think that the authors' main contribution is an attempt to find a term that draws attention to the bone changes related to chronic liver disease is really important. The best term and definitions will emerge from peer discussions. Therefore, it is important to raise the issue.

### **Response**

We are grateful to the reviewer for this comment. Indeed the purpose of the letter is to initiate such a discussion.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Interent point of view and approach in a frequent, but not always aknowledged issue.

### **Response**

We thank the reviewer for their encouraging feedback

Reviewer #3:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Strengths: The subject is novel and constructive. Weaknesses: Absence of definition and interpretation of the proposal word. Some specific concerns: The title should be rephrased to be more appropriated, e.g., Hepatomusculoskeletal Disorders: Coining a new term might be helpful for the management of chronic liver disease related musculoskeletal anormalities More rational and limitation of coining the new term should be added, e.g., that chronic

liver disease impacts metabolism and hormones and other aspects, resulting synergistically in musculoskeletal disorders, etc. Definition and interpretation of the proposal new term should be added, with comparison to other analogous coined terms. The term "Hepatoskeletal Disorders" may be rephrased as "Hepatomusculoskeletal Disorders", with reference to the context.

### **Response**

The title was revised to "Hepatomusculoskeletal Disorders: Coining a new term might be helpful for the management of chronic liver disease related musculoskeletal abnormalities" as recommended.

The proposed term has also been analysed to ensure that the readers comprehend the rationale for proposing this change

We thank the reviewer for raising this concern

Reviewer #4:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The newly proposed term "hepatoskeletal" disorders may not be compatible to present with the impact of chronic liver disease on the "musculo"skeletal system since "musculo" is omitted.

### **Response**

We thank the reviewer for raising this concern. The proposed term has been revised as "hepatomusculoskeletal"

Scientific editor

This letter to the editor is a correspondence addressing a number of WJGP articles related to chronic liver disease. The authors suggest the creation of an umbrella term hepatoskeletal disorders in response to the need to expand knowledge of chronic liver disease and use it as a form of practice guidelines that may improve the management of musculoskeletal manifestations of chronic liver disease. This is an important topic and may attract the attention of many readers. However, the author lacks a definition and interpretation of the proposal words and omits "muscle".

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

### **Response**

We thank the editor for expressing their concerns. The term has been revised as "hepatomusculoskeletal" in order to include the muscular component. Moreover, a

definition – analysis of the proposed term has been provided in accordance to the reviewers' comments.

*(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 Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology, 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**

We thank the editor in chief for coordinating this effort and providing feedback. The comments have been addressed.