

Thank you for your precious comments. It is very helpful to improve my article. And thank WJCC gives me the opportunity to revise my research. According to your suggestions, we have revised it. Hopefully it can reach WJCC requirement.

COMMENTS:

**Reviewer #1:**

1- the manuscript contains a huge number of grammar and typos mistakes and need to be checked very well.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We already have tried our best to correct grammars and typos mistakes in this manuscript, and also asked native speaker to carefully check it.**

2- The abstract is too long and required to shorten. □

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have deleted the sentence “and, until recently, a useful model to predict the technical success and midterm outcomes after procedure is lacking” in backgroud section to meet reviewer’s demand.**

3- Table 1 is unclear. unable to visualize the data in the table.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have revised table 1, please check it.**

**Reviewer #2:**

1. Patient Demographic characteristics - I think that they should be described in the Results section, not the Study design□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have already corrected it according to reviewer's suggestion.**

2. Imaging study and Image interpretation- The sentence „CT images were retrospectively evaluated by two blinded readers (, with 10, 5 years of experience in reading abdominal imaging, respectively)“ is incomplete, needs to be revised.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have already corrected it according to reviewer's suggestion.**

**Reviewer #3:**

Main comments:□1) A major linguistic revision is necessary.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We already have tried our best to correct grammars and typos mistakes in this manuscript, and also asked native speaker to carefully check it.**

2) Please report the 95% confidence interval of the k index.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have already corrected it according to reviewer's suggestion.**

3) Page 9: the technical success of TIPS according to CTPV score should be better tested by chi square test for trend.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have already corrected it according to reviewer's suggestion.**

4) It is unclear which parameters were included in the univariate analysis for factors predicting technical success and shunt dysfunction. The way in which Authors reported the results (figures) is not fully informative and should be replaced by a table in which all variables considered for statistical analysis are reported. For instance, it would be interesting to assess whether the etiology of liver cirrhosis may influence TIPS outcome.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have already corrected it according to reviewer's suggestion.**

5) Table 1: please add p values to compare the success vs the failure group.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have already corrected it according to reviewer's suggestion.**

6) It would be interesting to evaluate whether CTPV score may predict procedure-related complications and hepatic encephalopathy.□

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. Initially, we wanted to use CTPV scores to evaluate procedure-related complications, but our tutor finally decided that the use of CTPV scores to evaluate complications and post-procedure encephalopathy will be discussed in the next article.**

7) It is quite hard to interpret C-index for clinical nomogram by a non expert reader. Therefore, I suggest to add a brief paragraph to describe which values may be considered as satisfactory/optimal.

**We thank the reviewer for this important comment. We have already corrected it according to reviewer's suggestion, please check Statistical analysis section.**