

We thank the reviewers, the Science Editor and the Company Editor-in-chief for the comments and suggestions. We revised the manuscript according to their valuable comments; in particular:

Reviewer #1:

**Specific Comments to Authors:** there are no specific comments

We thank Reviewer #1 for the evaluation of our manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Thanks to the authors for their contributions. Pulmonary embolism is a very serious complication. Mortality is very high, and the onset is rapid, often without time for rescue. Therefore, the treatment of pulmonary embolism is very difficult, and we currently advocate prevention. This article reviews the latest progress in the treatment of pulmonary embolism. Authors are requested to provide information on title, author, unit, abstract, keywords and conclusion.

We thank Reviewer #1 for the evaluation of our manuscript.

## EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

### (1) *Science editor:*

This was a brief review. (1) The title may be changed to "Progress in Interventional Radiology Treatment of Pulmonary Embolism: A Brief Review."

We thank the Science editor for the suggestion: we modified the title accordingly.

(2) In the introduction section: "There have been many advances in the field of PE in the last few years: the development of new diagnostic and therapeutic strategies," had better be "There have been many advances in the field of PE in the recent decade(s): the development of new diagnostic and therapeutic strategies," for the references derived mainly from recent decades, other than last few years.

Thank you for the suggestion, we modified the sentence accordingly.

(3) In the Medical and Surgical Treatment section: "...with an high-risk pulmonary embolism, cardiac arrest, and circulatory collapse,..." =====should be "...with a high-risk pulmonary embolism, cardiac arrest, and circulatory collapse, ..."

Thank you for the suggestion, we modified the sentence accordingly.

(4) In the Medical and Surgical Treatment section: "(SaO2) "=====should be "(SaO2)".

Thank you for the suggestion, we modified the sentence accordingly.

(5) Summary and perspective section may be added as the last section.

Thank you for the suggestion, we added the “Summary: Guidelines on endovascular treatments” and the “New perspective” as the last sections.

(6) Some more articles of randomised trial or original articles had better be added to refine the review.

Thank you for the suggestion, we added an ongoing randomized clinical trial enrolling 700 patients (the PEERLESS trial), as well as original articles, to refine the review.

*(2) Company editor-in-chief:*

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Radiology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

We thank the Company Editor-in-chief for the comments: and hints we modified the table accordingly.

Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

We thank the Company Editor-in-chief for the suggestion: we used the RCA database searching the appropriate keywords and were able to obtain interesting articles to improve our research.