

## **Reviewer#1**

### **Specific comments to authors**

I had the opportunity to review a paper "Endoscopic Ultrasound Portal Pressure Gradient Measurement and Its Impact in Managing Portal Hypertension", and I found very interesting. There is no problem to publish the manuscript.

**Answer:** Thanks for your comments.

## **Reviewer#2**

### **Specific comments to authors**

Thanks for sharing the author's insights on this cutting-edge topic. There are several suggestions. 1. Authors mentioned "Another issue in clinical practice is that not all cases might have accurate portal pressure measurement through this indirect measurement procedure." It is suggested to add specific reasons and supplementary references. **[Answer: the reasons and additional references have been added]** 2. Authors mentioned "Possible contraindications, such as allergic reaction to contrast agent, cardiac arrhythmia during catheter insertion in transjugular route, and risk of bleeding in patient with very low platelet count or prolonged international normalized ratio (INR)". This is not a completed sentence. Authors may consider rephrasing it. **[Answer: Already revised]** 3. Many statements in this manuscript lack necessary references, and authors are advised to check the whole manuscript carefully and make some additions. Including but not limited to "Possible contraindications, such as allergic reaction to contrast agent, cardiac arrhythmia during catheter insertion in transjugular route, and risk of bleeding in patient with very low platelet count or prolonged international normalized ratio (INR).", "In the early stage, CSPH condition can be prevented with early medication.", "However, whether EUS evaluation is needed in the first setting in all patients with liver cirrhosis for deep varices

evaluation is still debatable", "Last but not least, EUS-PPG measurement can be performed and then followed by EUS-guided cyanoacrylate injection for large or deep gastroesophageal as well as isolated gastric varices". [Answer: References have been added] 4. The part of "Endoscopic Ultrasound Portal Pressure Gradient Measurement in Portal Hypertension" has too few contents, with only 10 references. There is a lot of research and progress that needs to be included. The present manuscript may not sufficiently reveal the authors' full understanding and experiences about this established topic "Endoscopic Ultrasound Portal Pressure Gradient Measurement and Its Impact in Managing Portal Hypertension". The following contents are still lacking, such as new ideas, new directions, present difficulties, and future direction of this current topic. [Answer: References have been added]

### **Reviewer#3**

#### **Specific comments to authors**

Endoscopic Ultrasound Portal Pressure Gradient Measurement and Its Impact in Managing Portal Hypertension Reviewer's comments. Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? • Yes. Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? • Yes, the abstract cover the main aspect of the work Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? o It is recommended to use MeSH headings as the keywords. Please correct, if possible. [Answer: Already corrected] Introduction. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? • The Introduction of the manuscript has tried to provide the background and information relevant to the study but it has some spelling errors. [Answer: The manuscript has been re-editing] • Even though several literatures are mentioned it's a little bit bulky to read and lacks coherency and flow. It will better if the authors summaries it in a table, mentioning the country the study, the

sample size, and types of the study (i.e., experimental/observational) **[Answer: Table has been made]** • An essential detail of the case that allows to a useful conclusion is mentioned.

- The discussion part looks relevant, clear and concise.
- Key concepts are listed.
- Relevant literatures are well discussed, however strengths and limitations in your approach to this case is not mentioned, please add the possible limitations and strengths of your approach to the case. **[Answer: Already added]**

Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? • Figures are in a good quality.

Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? • N/A

Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? • Yes.

References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? • The references of the manuscript has to follow the referencing style guidelines of the journal. **[Answer: Already revised]**

Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? • Some part of the discussion has grammatical errors and should be addressed. **[Answer: Already re-edited]**

Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? • There is no any ethical or any other concern raised. The approval has been granted.

## Revision reviewer

### Specific comments to authors

1. It is incomprehensible and unacceptable that the reviewers' comments have yet to be

answered as requested, although the authors have made some modifications. [Answer: Already revised as requested] 2. There are still many syntax errors. [Answer: Already Re-editing with official language editing certificate] 3. It is recommended not to omit "0" in the description of the p-value. [Answer: Already revised. Eg: It is "p < .001"]