

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

September 15, 2013



Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 5025-review.doc).

Title: LIVER TRANSPLANTATION FOR HILAR CHOLANGIOCARCINOMA

AUTHORS: Ricardo Robles, Francisco Sánchez-Bueno, Pablo Ramírez, Roberto Brusadin, Pascual Parrilla

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5025

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer:

Referee 1.- The authors, Robles R. et al., well summarize the past and current status of liver transplantation for hilar cholangiocarcinoma in this review manuscript. All the relevant previous studies on the topic are properly included and discussed, then the authors conclude that correct staging, priority on the MELD and living donor liver transplantation (LT) may improve the result. However, I feel that a more detailed recommendation might make this manuscript more informative for the readers.

Following the instructions of the referee we modify the conclusions and the article is back translated by a native English doctor.

Referee 2.- This is a very comprehensive review of the literature and outcomes related to the management of hilar cholangiocarcinome and the role of liver transplantation. It is a hard read following study after study and I would prefer to see each study presented under a subheading. Then presented in a similar way: size of study, interventions and outcomes. Then as a conclusion I would like to see a recommendation from the authors based on the data they have presented what is the best approach in their opinion? It would seem to be Neo adjunct therapy, plus chemo plus strict selection criteria and LT. I would like the authors conclusion following this very complete review.

Although the comments of the referee are adequate in relation to the structure of the review article, we consider this form of presentation is most suitable because it gives us an overview of the historical process of the use of liver transplantation in Klatskin tumor. Following the instructions of the referee we modify the conclusions.

Referee 3.- This is a good review on the topic, valuable for the readers of the Journal.

We appreciate the comments of the referee.

Referee 4.- The manuscript is well-written and well-researched. All the pertinent previous studies on the matter are quoted and taken into consideration. An international perspective is considered and conclusions are well-documented. I consider the manuscript worth publishing for the useful information that it brings to liver transplant surgeons for the treatment early-stage KT with and without neoadjuvancy. The Authors might want to review some minor language issues. For example, the past tense should be used at times instead of the present tense, when reporting on past experiences.

We appreciate the comments of the referee, and the article is back translated by a native English doctor.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Ricardo Robles

Professor of Surgery

Coordinator and Head of the HPB section from the Spanish Surgical Association