

Response letter

Dear editors,

Thank you very much for the editorial staff and reviewers' hard-work in processing our manuscript entitled **Lymphocyte-to-white blood cell ratio is associated with outcome in patients with hepatitis B virus-related acute-on-chronic liver failure (No: 84643)**. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as guiding significance to our researches, we have read the comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. We hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses will be sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in the World Journal of Gastroenterology. First, we polished our manuscript again and uploaded the related file to the journal. Second, we have corrected some details, including Reference 3 should be insert into the first sentence, the full name of "LWR" has been unified as Lymphocyte-to-white blood cell ratio in the manuscript, the title of table 3 had been revised, some minor details were corrected and we also revised some format problem according to the journal's requirements. Third, the format of the images has been modified to ensure compliance with the format of the journal, but the content of the images has not changed. Correspondence about the paper should be directed to Xuan Zhu at the following address, and e-mail address: waiyongtg@163.com.

We shall look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Best wishes,

Dr Zhu, Dr Zhang, Dr Chen.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Response: Thank you very much for your work.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, 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. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file. Please authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving

the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: Thank you very much for your work. I had revised my manuscript according to your requirements.

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 1

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: It is an interesting manuscript. Authors succeed to present their data in a clear way adding information to the existing literature. Therefore, I have no corrections to do and the manuscript can be published unaltered.

Response: Thank you very much for your evaluation. I had polished my manuscript again according to your requirements.

Reviewer 2

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The article is well written and deals with an important topic in management of ACLF.

Response: Thank you very much for your evaluation.

Reviewer 3

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: No special comments. Good reference for HBV-infected patients.

Response: Thank you very much for your evaluation. I had polished my manuscript again according to your requirements.