

ROUND 1

Response to reviewers

To the editors:

Thank you for allowing us to revise and resubmit our manuscript. Our responses to the reviews is below. Please contact me with any additional questions

Sincerely,
Dr. Sundaram

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: The article reads well and the topic is very relevant. I have minor observations. There are two key words sections and both of them don't match. ACLF -1 is misspelt as ALCF-1. I would suggest change in the title of table 1. The title and the table content doesn't seem to correlate. Thank you

Thank you for your thoughtful comments. We have changed the misspelling as suggested and have also changed the title of the table accordingly.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is an engaging and instructive review about the evolution of the liver allocation system. However, the authors simply focus on the US liver allocation policies, forgetting the rest of the world, e.g., Asia or Europe.

Three major issues should be addressed before considering publication; 1) Given the manuscript's title, the authors should also address liver allocation policies and rules in other regions except the US. Several different allocation systems in Europe and Asia should be discussed under this broad title,

Thank you for your thoughtful comments. We have added a section regarding organ allocation throughout the world

2) The title announces future directions; however, the section on future direction is missing,

Thank you for this comment. We have added a section regarding future directions at the end of the manuscript.

3) the conclusion of the entire paper is missing – giving the impression of unfinished work.

We have added a concluding paragraph
Some minor issues should also be addressed:

1) Table 1, only relevant data should be listed in the table, please omit unnecessary words, please add abbreviations which are missing below the table,

We have modified the table accordingly. Thank you

2) please add visual context (figure/scheme) explaining some of the policies such as Regional Share 15/Regional Share for Status 1/ Regional Share 35 and National Share 15/Acuity Circles Distribution System; it would be much easier for the reader to follow and understand, and it would give an added value to your manuscript.

We have added a figure (figure 1) to address the reviewer concern

The paper is not prepared according to the journal's requirements (title page, font, references..)

We have modified the formatting in accordance with journal requirements

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Accepted as minireview

Thank you for accepting our article

ROUND 2

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript has been improved according to the reviewer's suggestions. However, please be careful about the references, there are numerous mistakes throughout the text (superscript, square brackets) and in the references (missing PMID, all authors should be listed..) please correct according journal's requirements.

The manuscript has been revised.