Dear Editor-in-Chief of World Journal of Hepatology,

We are pleased to receive the comments from the editors and reviewers and we would like to thank you for helping us to improve the quality of the manuscript. Herein, we present our answers to each question and changes made in the paper.

**Reviewer #1**

“*This is a well-written review article that perfectly mentions the present understanding of the different noninvasive methods for the diagnosis of periportal fibrosis in Schistosomiasis mansoni, including biological (serum biomarkers or combined scores) or physical assessments (imaging assessment of fibrosis pattern or tissue stiffness, such as ultrasound, computed tomography, magnetic resonance imaging and elastography). I have no concern for the current version of the manuscript. However, I recommend the authors to compare the advantage and disadvantage of these methods in clinical application of the diagnosis of periportal fibrosis in Schistosomiasis mansoni*”.

We appreciate the comments and agree with the reviewer’s recommendation. The advantages and disadvantages of the referred methods in clinical practice are now compared and included on a new table (Table 6) and reinforced on the conclusion.

**Science editor:**

“The subject of the manuscript is suitable for the journal. (2) Manuscripts reviewed and cited are closely related to the subject. (3) The methods reviewed by the authors are reasonable and the results are reliable. (4) It would be better for the author to compare the advantages and disadvantages of various clinical examination methods”.
We appreciate the comments and agree with the reviewer’s recommendation. The advantages and disadvantages of the referred methods in clinical practice are now compared and included on a new table (Table 6) and reinforced on the conclusion.

**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 Hepatology, 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. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor”.

The original figure documents are now prepared on power point and attached as revision files.

Again, we appreciate all comments. We tried our best to be responsive to them. Thank you to help us improve the paper.

Best regards,

The authors.