## First reviewer's comments and replay

| 1        | History of present illness needs to be rewritten  | Agreed and done.                                      |
|----------|---|---|
| 2        | The patient had colon surgery, but for physical examination, the authors did not report surgical scarring.  | Physical examination is corrected                     |
| 3        | The accurate values of AFP, CEA and CA-199 etc, should be given even if they are within the normal range.   | accurate values of AFP, CEA and CA-<br>199 are added. |
| 4        | Diabetes mellitus (staging) should be added to the secondary diagnosis in the final diagnosis, and management strategies for diabetes mellitus should be described. | Agreed and done                                       |
| <u>5</u> | The present discussion is simply an anatomical review. Therefore, the hazards, prevention, risk events management of the intrahepatic portosystemic venous shunts   | Agreed and done                                       |

## Second reviewer's comments and replay

|    | T   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1  | Mention few details and intent of your procedure.   | Done. The intent of procedure is to enhance the future liver remnant (left liver lobe) volume   |
| 2  | Initial portogram was done; why it was not able to identify the communication ?                       | I was able to see it at early phase portogram and I interpret it as an apparent portal vein variant segmental branch. I was unable to recognize the communication with IVC in late phase portogram due to multiple portal branches. |
| 3  | What were the volumes of glue/lipoidol emulasion.   | 9 ml (8 ml lipiodol and 1 ml glue)  |
| 4  | Discussion- It needs to be further enriched.  | Done  |
| 5  | What was the author's communication type out of four mentioned ?                                      | Type 1 which is the commonest. I also add it in the discussion  |
| 6  | What is the treatment if non target embolization happens?   | Conservative as patient was asymptomatic.   |
| 7  | Is the treatment conservative or interventional; is it dose dependent ?                               | Conservative management. The non-target embolization was not dose dependent due to the rare fistula. The conservative management decision was due to small amount and asymptomatic.   |
| 8  | Portosystemic venous fistula- What changes it induces in organs connecting, what clues can suggest it | Small fistula may usually no change. Large fistula may divert portal flow lead to liver part atrophy, underdevelopment, or pulmonary hypertension.  |
| 9  | The conclusion may add the clues on imaging for such fistula.   | Small fistula in adult patient usually has no other associated features or clue   |
| 10 | The arrows marks are clear; put better ones.  | Agreed and Done   |