

Response to reviewer's comments:

Reviewer 1

- 1) The manuscript must be carefully proofread for grammar, spelling, and punctuation issues.
 - The manuscript was checked and improved for grammar, spelling and punctuation issues.
- 2) It is recommended that authors improve the design of Tables and Figures.
 - The Tables and Figures were checked and improved.
- 3) The discussion part is not well written and needs a major rewrite.
 - The discussion part was checked and improved.
- 4) Use of newer references is recommended.
 - It was done.
- 5) The manuscript does not describe methods (e.g., experiments and data analysis) in adequate detail.
 - It was checked and improved.
- 6) The Manuscript does not meet the requirements of biostatistics. In my opinion, this section is not well written and needs revision and rewriting.
 - The statistical methods of this study were composed, verified and written by very professional biostatistician. I disagree with above reviewer's opinion.

Reviewer 2

- 1) Aim in abstract not quite clear. Grammar checking required. Paper was difficult to read
 - The aim of the paper was to present profiles of IFN γ and IL2 after alloHSCT in patients with/without GvHD and infection complication. The manuscript was checked and improved for grammar, spelling and punctuation issues.
- 2) Sentence should not be started with a number in scientific writing e.g. 62 in the methods. Please check throughout - Still in abstract, the first a the phrase "consisting of" should be between study and 30 " - Last sentence of core tip should be rephrased and the words "thanks to this..." removed completed and in the discussion section - In the materials and methods, include country name at the end of Medical University of Silesia in Katowice - In the sentence All the patients underwent standard immunosuppressive therapy, including 95%... specify the number and not just the percentage - -80 degrees Celsius and not -80 degrees of Celsius
 - It was improved.
- 3) What does ...5 mL per clot in ...5 mL per clot at the following time points: before mean?

- Blood samples were collected with preparation to gain serum for further analysis.

4) Authors should elaborate on the ELISA assay, providing detailed description

- What's the reason of describing the ELISA procedure? In study was used the standard ELISA kit, which functionality and way of usage is well-known in the scientific society.

5) Methods section should have a statistical analysis and subsection and not described in the results section

- It was checked and improved.

6) - Statistics described in the results can be better written.

- The statistical methods of this study were composed, verified and written by very professional biostatistician. I disagree with above reviewer's opinion.