

Below is the response to individual reviewers,

1. The manuscript is interesting. I still consider it a bit long. The authors have not highlighted the changes they made to the manuscript, after the first revision. This makes the second revision hard, because it is very difficult to see which parts of the initial text were modified. I suggest the authors to use the "track changes" function for their next manuscript. The authors have answered almost all my questions.

Response: Thank you very much for your kind feedback.

- The manuscript has been edited to allow for a shorter version, I will attach the initial version with the tracked changes.

2. This review addresses an interesting topic, that of liver injury in children and adolescents. I have some suggestions. 1. The review is well written but it is too long. The authors should decide on what they want to focus in this manuscript: the mechanisms and the clinical presentation or the management. I think the material the authors used in this review could be better structured and used for 2 reviews instead of a very long single review. 2. If possible, the authors could use the PRISMA flow chart to better highlight the selection process of the articles they used. 3. In Epidemiology, paragraph 2, the authors could mention also a groundbreaking research on this topic: Bende F, Tudoran C, Sporea I, Fofiu R, Bâldea V, Cotrău R, Popescu A, Sirli R, Ungureanu BS, Tudoran M. A Multidisciplinary Approach to Evaluate the Presence of Hepatic and Cardiac Abnormalities in Patients with Post-Acute COVID-19 Syndrome—A Pilot Study. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*. 2021; 10(11):2507. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10112507> 4. The conclusions are too long and do not express the findings of the manuscript.

Response: Thank you very much for your kind feedback.

- We are open to your recommendation of splitting the manuscript but invited to write a single with waiver of the fees, if the journal is kind enough to accept two reviews, we are more than happy to divide this manuscript into two reviews instead of one single review.
- The selection process did not involve PRISMA selection process. However, all articles included are selected from highly indexed journals in this field.
- Thank you for highlighting the groundbreaking research papers on this topic. The suggested articles have been included in the edited version of the paper.
- The conclusion has also been edited to express the findings of the manuscript.

3. The manuscript is clear and explicit. I have no comment to contribute.

Response: Thank you very much for your kind feedback.

- No changes or editing has been requested.