

To  
The Editor  
World Journal of Hepatology

Dear Editor,

**Re: Number ID: 31863**

**Outcomes of pregnancy in patients with known Budd–Chiari syndrome –  
Answering the reviewers**

Many thanks for reviewing our article and giving us the feedback.

We have revised the manuscript as per recommendations and guidance.  
Following is the response to the individual reviewers.

### **1) First Reviewer (code: 00066840)**

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very nice manuscript. Minor BCS preexisted. However, the shortest time interval between BCS and conception was 0 years. Interval should be given in months or days. (Changed to 3 months).

Table 1: Liver biopsy results can be omitted. Tables 1&2: Abbreviations should be given in the legend. (Done/ changes made)

Typo: Bechet's disease -> Becet's disease (corrected to 'Behcet's disease').

### **2) Second reviewer (code: 02823562)**

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting observational analysis of BCS in relation to pregnancy. Previous data are scarce and heterogeneous. The manuscript is nicely written. Tables are somehow difficult to understand due to their extension and large word counting in some cells. Percentages are not integrated: some of them refer to the proportion of patients and other to the proportion of pregnancies.

(We have made sure the percentages are integrated in the revised manuscript).

In relation to the conclusion: I do not agree with the concept that gestation outcomes in BCS pregnant female patients are overall good... There are 38% of fetal loss (though 2 cases might be attributed to cervical weakness) and a 60% (6 out of 10 non-miscarried pregnancies) of preterm deliveries. In my opinion, that is not at all good outcomes. (We have discussed this in the manuscript).

I have found that study period in the abstract is from Jan2001 to Dec2015, but in manuscript text it is stated Dec2014. Which one is correct?? (Corrected to December 2015).

### **3) Third reviewer (code: 03477936)**

#### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1-'Out of 53 females with BCS, 7 women had 16 pregnancies' should be explained with a clearer expression. (It was more suitable explained in the result section with the sentence 'Out of these, 7 patients had 16 pregnancies during the study period'. (Changed to 'Out of 53 females identified with BCS,').

2-'At least one causal factor for BCS was identified in 6 women (86%)' when it is out of 7 patients what should we say to the 53 females with BCS. This sentence should be more clearly expressed. (We included only those female patients with BCS, who became pregnant during the study period)

3-'These patients should be managed in centres experienced in treating high-risk pregnancies'. Centres should be centers (in British English it is 'centres')

4-'ischaemic injury to the liver and portal hypertension' should be ischemic injury to the liver and portal hypertension. (Changed. British spellings are 'Ischaemic').

5-'Usually multiple risk factors for venous thromboembolism are present in patients with BCS' (1,5-7) should be (1.5-7) in English articles. (These are separate references 1, 5, 6 and 7)

6-The introduction part is very long and some sentences should be in the discussion section.

7-The reference order is not sequential (13 before (11-12) and when it was used et al in the beginning of the sentence reference number should followed this word phase. (We have revised the reference order as per guidance).

We have attached the approval statement from the institution and the audio file. Please do not hesitate to email me should you have any query.

I look forward to the favourable response.

Yours sincerely

Dr Faisal Khan  
MB, MRCP (London), MRCP (Gastroenterology)  
SpR In Gastroenterology  
Email: faisalkhan@doctors.org.uk