

Point by Point Response to Reviewer Comments

Dear Sir(s)

We are extremely thankful for the comments from the reviewers and the editors. We have addressed the concerns in a point by point manner and have accordingly revised the manuscript. We have highlighted the response in the response letter as well as in the manuscript. We have provided a marked copy of all the changes made, along with corresponding clean copy of the main document.

Reviewer #1:

Comment 1: Some references format need to be adjusted

Authors response: Thank you for the comments. We have formatted the references with respect to capitalization, italics, bold font, PMID and DOI update and complete author details. The refs are also updated for information within the Tables.

Comment 2: In the end of this review, the author propose some future prospective, it is recommended to select important content to expand.

Authors response: Thank you for the comments. We have abridged this section and made a concise paragraph to highlight focused aspects.

Reviewer #2:

Comment 1: There are no data regarding TIPS complications including stent migration, Difficulties During Stent Placement, Difficulties During Portal Vein Access, Difficulty Faced During Portal Vein Localization. Moreover, the information about the patency time of TIPS is lacking.

Authors response: Thank you for the comments. We have added a new Table 3 with all suggested major technical challenges and complications and prevention and management strategies. This has been quoted in the text also in the revision. A detailed discussion on technical aspects on all of the concerns was not within the scope of this review, but the new Table 3 concisely demonstrates pertinent information on the same.

Reviewer #3:

Comment 1: nice review; there are no specific comments

Authors response: Thank you for your warm comments.

Thanking you for your kind comments and help in improving the manuscript. We hope the revision are as expected.

Warm regards

Corresponding Author.