

<b>Journal name</b>	<i>World Journal of Hepatology</i>
<b>Manuscript submission No.</b>	79994
<b>Title</b>	Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of COVID-19 in Patients With Autoimmune Hepatitis: A Population-Based Matched Cohort Study
<b>Authors</b>	Arunkumar Krishnan, Ruhee A Patel, Yousaf Bashir Hadi, Diptasree Mukherjee, Sarah Shabih, Shyam Thakkar, Shailendra Singh, Tinsay A Woreta and Saleh A Alqahtani

S. No	Editor/Reviewers	Comments	Answer/Response
<b>Peer Review Comments</b>			
1.	<b>Editor-in-Chief</b>	I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Hepatology. 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.	Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript and for your comment. We appreciate it. We have revised the manuscript and supplementary and improved the manuscript as recommended
1.	<b>Reviewer#1</b>	The manuscript is well written and easy to read and to understand. But on page 6, second paragraph I think the authors confused HIV	Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript and

		<p>and AIH: they wrote "All adult patients (age ≥18 years) with HIV and confirmed COVID-19 ... instead of: All adult patients (age ≥18 years) with AIH and confirmed COVID-19...</p>	<p>sharing your comments. We appreciate your time.</p> <p>" AIH" was mistakenly modified as "HIV" during submission due to the autocorrect feature. We have corrected it to "AIH."</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><b>Reviewer#2</b></p>	<p>Comments to the author In the manuscript entitled "Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes of COVID-19 in Patients with Autoimmune Hepatitis: A Population-Based Matched Cohort Study", the authors demonstrated that AIH patients are associated with an increased hospitalization risk as well as the higher mortality compared to patients without chronic liver diseases (CLD) from the diagnosis of COVID-19. In addition, they also concluded that AIH patients were not at the risk for the worse outcomes with</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript and sharing your comments. We appreciate your time.</p>

		<p>COVID-19 than other causes of CLD. While the findings of this study are of interest and persuasion, the current study is lacking the cutting edge to be accepted for publication. To overcome this limitation, authors are recommended to modify the manuscript according to the comments which are mentioned below.</p>	
<p>3.</p>		<p>First of all, there were lots of miscalculation and the fact seriously undermined the credibility of this paper. For example, though authors wrote 8.8% and 11% in the main text of page 8 line 2, 8.7% and 10.9% were in the Table 1. In the line 4 and line 5, authors indicated 23.4% and 14.3%, but 23.3% and 14.2%, respectively in the Table 1. In the line 7 and line 9 of page 8, similar mistakes were seen.</p> <p>In the page 10 line 13, though authors wrote RR 0.93; 95% CI, 0.34-0.68, but 0.93 (0.55-1.56) in the</p>	<p>We have carefully corrected the errors with numbers throughout the main manuscript, matching our main results in the tables and figures.</p> <p>We performed a thorough critical revision of the manuscript. We have checked and revised the manuscript for important intellectual content.</p>

		Figure 3. I knew that there were actually some other mistakes in the table. Based on these facts, authors should have to check their manuscript, figures, tables, and all supplementary tables seriously and correct all of them. If not, resubmission should be rejected	
4.		In the second paragraph of page 9, authors used “p=<0.01” for four times. I think all of these should be corrected as “p<0.01”.	We have corrected the error and modified the p-value as recommended.
5.		In the page 13, line 3&4, the authors repeated “Finally” twice in the main text. It was quite weird	This was due to the autocorrect feature, and the same word, “ Finally,” was repeated twice. We have done meticulous proofreading to avoid these errors.
6.		On page 5 line 12, authors wrote that all adult patients with HIV and ////. Why patients with HIV were collected in this study? Could you explain the reason?	“ AIH” was mistakenly modified as “HIV” during submission due to the autocorrect feature. We have

			corrected it to "AIH."
7.		In the methods section of the abstract, "patients 1) without chronic liver disease (CLD); 2) patients with chronic liver diseases (non-CLD) but without AIH (non-AIH CLD) control groups." was difficult to understand. How about the followings "patients 1) without chronic liver disease (non-CLD); 2) patients with chronic liver diseases except AIH (non-AIH CLD) control groups."	We have modified the statement as recommended
8.		The last sentence of "Introduction" was also difficult to understand. Anyhow, authors need to realize that they should examine their own manuscripts more carefully before submission.	We have revised the introduction section, and updated these sections with the latest literature.

We thank the editor and reviewer for taking the time to review our manuscript and sharing your comments. We appreciate your time. We have revised the manuscript and supplementary and improved the manuscript as recommended

**Minor comments:**

**Comment 1:** In the Page 10 Line 4, "fibrinogen level P(303 vs. 436 mg/dL; P = 0.03)" will be changed to "fibrinogen level (303 vs. 436 mg/dL; P = 0.03)". Is it correct?

In the Page 10 Line 8 and 10, authors wrote the unit of bilirubin as "U/L". I think it would be "mg/dL". Is it correct?

**Answer:** Thank you for pointing out the errors. We have carefully corrected the errors with numbers throughout the main manuscript and in the supplementary tables.

**Answer:** We have carefully corrected the errors with numbers throughout the main manuscript, matching our main results in the tables and figures.

**Comment 2:** In the “Discussion” section (Page 11 Line 21), authors wrote “However, a lower survival probability was also noted for AIH patients.”. Why did authors choose the word “However”? Another conjunction word would be fine for readers.

**Answer:** We have modified the sentence by using another conjunction as recommended.

**Comment 3:** In the Page 12 Line1, “U.S.based” would be “U.S.-based”. Is it correct? Anyhow, authors actually did a wonderful job! Congratulations!

**Answer:** We have carefully corrected the error and modified it to “U.S.-based.”