

Halifax, May 20, 2013
Nova Scotia, Canada

**Paper submitted to the World Journal of Gastroenterology
No. 2641**

Dear editors,

On behalf of all the authors of the paper No 2641 entitled “Pathophysiology, epidemiology, classification and treatment options for polycystic liver disease” I would like to thank you and the reviewers for the feedback received and for all the suggestions needed to improve our paper.

We have extensively revised the submitted paper, and we are listing all the changes that were necessary to satisfy the recommendations made by the reviewers.

Reviewer # 1.

Recommendations 1. Abstract line 4: ‘PLD’ should be corrected to ‘PCLD’.

Action: changed made as per recommendation.

Recommendation 2 Page 6, line 1: ‘CA19.9’ should be corrected to ‘CA19-9’.

Action: changed made as per recommendation.

Recommendation 3 Page 8, last paragraph: ‘PLD’ should be corrected to ‘PCLD’.

Action: changed made as per recommendation.

Recommendation 4 Could you comment on it. Could you comment both on the diagnosis and management in case of infection?

Action: in the revised paper, we have included a paragraph where we review the literature on the tests used to diagnose and treat patients with infected cysts.

Reviewer # 2

Recommendation 1. The authors have decided for us the readers which articles to discuss. The selection criteria are unclear and as such I prefer that a more systematic approach is being followed (i.e. systematic selection of sources).

Action: the available literature is made only by case series and case reports. A systematic review would have not been possible. In our review, we have cited the largest experiences and the reports published from authoritative groups. We disagree with the comments made by this reviewer. In our institution, we have a very extensive experience with patients with PLD. In the past, previous surgeons have not published their experience. However, we are addressing this by reviewing our data and hopefully we will be able to publish our experience.

Recommendation 2. Most important, the definition and interpretation by the authors of the abbreviations PLD, PCLD, ADPKD and ADPLD does not correspond with the most influential cited literature which might lead to confusion. There is rather inconsequential use of abbreviations. At present time no consensus exists on PLD abbreviations, but in view of the most authoritative sources published in prominent journals on this topic, I would recommend the following in terms of abbreviations and definitions.

Action: all the abbreviations have been changed as recommended

Recommendation 3. The overall readability is unsatisfactory because of poor use of the English language, unclear lay-out and numerous tables and figures. I suggest that the authors are a bit more restrictive. Furthermore, text references to tables and figures frequently do not correspond with the table and figure numbers. See the remarks under 'specific comments' for advice.

Action: the paper has been extensively revised and the language has been reviewed by several English speaking individuals.

In summary, we are very grateful to all the reviewers and the editors for giving us the opportunity to improve our paper. We hope that after all these revisions; our submission will find a favorable review.

Sincerely,

Michele Molinari
Associate Professor
Department of Surgery and Community Health
Dalhousie University