

Dear Editorial Team,

We would like to thank you for providing valuable insight for our manuscript titled “ **Median Arcuate Ligament Syndrome (MALS); often a diagnostic challenge. A literature review with a scope of our own experience**”. We reviewed the manuscript according to the reviewers’ suggestions and made the appropriate corrections. More specifically;

**Specific Comments To Authors:** Median Arcuate Ligament Syndrome (MALS) is a rare clinical entity which is often misdiagnosed. This paper reported the clinical presentation and treatment of two cases of MALS and reviewed the clinical features, diagnosis and treatment, which has important reference value for the recognize of MALS. Minor questions 1. Please make the figures according to the journal’s request. 2. In the paper ,there are MRI and MRA, which is correct? Please write the whole name of the abbreviation, Please write the whole name of SMA.

Review 1;

Reply; We agree with Review 1. We performed a review with the purpose of language polishing. Specifically, in Page 2, “a number of years” was replaced by “several years”. Additionally, “in order to” was replaced by “to”. In Page 3, “it’s” was replaced by “it is”, and “one could say” was replaced by “many researchers believe”. In Page 4, “past personal history” was replaced by “past medical history”, and “brunches” was replaced by “branches”. In Page 6 we reworded the highlighted sentence by the reviewer as follows; “These anatomical prerequisites are found in 10-24% of the population. Based on this percentage, MALS could be responsible for more cases of chronic mesenteric ischemia cases than was previously thought.”. In Page 8 we reworded the highlighted sentence by the reviewer as follows; “ In a recent retrospective study regarding patients receiving orthotopic liver transplantation, the presence of MALS dictated different management for the graft to be preserved and the procedure to be a success.” In Page

9 and 11 we corrected the highlighted grammatical errors. Thank you for providing valuable feedback to our manuscript.

**Specific Comments To Authors:** Page 2 Abstract “a number of years” is vague and perhaps not the best for a medical journal “in order to” could be simplified/reworded. This phrase is used throughout the manuscript. Simply changing “in order to” to “to” would suffice. Page 3 Introduction “it’s” is the contraction of “it is,” where this use should be the possessive “its” “one could say” is also quite informal for a medical journal Case Presentation #1 “personal past history” may be better worded as “past medical history” Page 4 Case Presentation #1 “identifying the brunches of the celiac artery” should be “branches” Page 6 Discussion “These anatomical prerequisites for clinical expression of MALS is found at 10-24% of the population.” This sentence needs to be re-worded. “prerequisites... are” would fix the problem of subject/verb agreement. “at” should be “in” “So” could be dropped from the next sentence. This is unnecessary and informal. Page 8 Discussion “MALS forced for different management in order for the graft...” this needs to be reworded Page 9 Discussion “but were actually not” has an extra space between actually and not NSQIP is not spelled out here Page 11 “patient’s” should be “patients”

Review 2;

Reply; We agree with Review 2. All abbreviations have been provided and corrected (mainly, MRI, MRA and SMA, as per the reviewer’s comments). Thank you for providing valuable feedback to our manuscript.

Please let us know if more changes are necessary.

Best regards,

Gregory Christodoulidis MD PhD

Senior Consultant in Upper GI Surgery

University hospital of Larissa

Larissa Greece