

Response to reviewer comments

Reviewer #1:

1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.
2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?
3. Conclusion: not properly written.
4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.
5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. 6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 7. English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer for these observations. The reviewer's comments do not align with the content of the editorial article because the reviewer refers, in points 2, 4, and 5, to results, discussion, which are part of the original manuscript and not components of an editorial that only consists of a main text.

In accordance with the comments pertaining to sections such as "Results" and "Discussion," the authors acknowledge that the valuable contributions made by the reviewer pertain to the original article upon which the Editorial, presented herein, is grounded. It is important to note that the original article has already undergone peer review and has been accepted. In light of this, if there has been any oversight on our part, we are committed to addressing it promptly and thoroughly. In light of this, we have taken the liberty to articulate certain differences on specific topics, as well as to articulate our perspective on defined concepts, should not be construed in any way as an attempt to discredit the work conducted by the colleagues who reviewed the original manuscript from (Perilipin2 inhibits the replication of hepatitis B virus deoxyribonucleic acid by regulating autophagy under high-fat conditions Manuscript No.: 86924).

We also apologize for any grammatical mistakes and appreciate the reviewer's kind observations. Grammar corrections were made by a native speaker, and careful attention was given to editing throughout the manuscript.