

Dear Editor,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of our manuscript titled “Hepatic venous pressure gradient: inaccurately estimates portal venous pressure gradient in alcoholic cirrhosis and portal hypertension” to the *World Journal of Gastroenterology Surgery*. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. We have highlighted the changes within the manuscript.

Appended to this letter is our point-by-point response to the comments raised by the reviewers. The comments are reproduced and our responses are given directly afterward in a different color (red).

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. We hope the revised manuscript could be acceptable for publication in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology Surgery*.

Thank you in advance for your time and effort!

Best regards,

Sincerely yours,

Fuquan Liu

Department of Interventional Therapy,

Beijing Shijitan Hospital,

Capital Medical University,

Beijing 100038, China,

Phone: 86-13701179758

E-mail: liufuquan@ccmu.edu.cn

A response to the comments made by the reviewers

We really appreciate the reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions. According to the comments of the reviewers, we have revised our manuscript and the comments are answered one by one as follows.

Reviewer #1: *As you mentioned in your conclusions that the correlation between WHVP and PVP as well as that between HVPG and PPG in patients with alcoholic cirrhosis and complications of PHT is very poor, and the correlation in most cases are still poor. The cause of this remains unknown, and further investigation is required in this area to elucidate these mechanisms..*

Response: Thank you for your patience in reviewing our article and your valuable comments!

Reviewer #2: *Dear Author(s), I would like you to make the following changes to your article: 1. The title of the article should be updated to reflect the objective for which the current study was conceived and carried out. 2. Considering the balance in presenting information between the various elements of the study abstract is critical and should be prioritized. 3. Only the most important results obtained by the current investigation should be shown in the results section of the study abstract, without undue extravagance. 4. The study's introduction should be separated into three paragraphs, as follows: - The first paragraph discusses the significance of the current study. - The second paragraph describes the knowledge gap that the current study is attempting to fill. - The third paragraph should clarify the research problem and how it will be solved within the context of the present study's goal. 5. Is there a reliable reason that can be added to explain why the statistical method employed in the Statistical methods section of the manuscript was chosen? 6. Rewriting the conclusion to show whether or not the present research challenge -research problem- has been solved? 7. Some references are outdated and should be replaced, and I propose that authors must just using references from 2023 and the five years before that. Best of luck.*

Response: We think these are excellent suggestions. According to question 1, we have changed the title to “Hepatic venous pressure gradient: inaccurately estimates portal venous pressure gradient in alcoholic cirrhosis and portal hypertension”. In light of questions 2 and 3, we added the difference between HVPG and PPG in the two groups. According to question 4, we have revised the introduction in response to your comments, adding a description of the gaps in the field of study and our core purpose for this research. According to question 5, to deplore the relationship between HVPG and PPG, we mainly used Pearson's correlation to assess the correlation and Bland-Altman plots to analyze the agreement between HVPG and PPG, which has been mentioned in statistical methods. As for question 6, we have modified our conclusions to add that HVPG is not an accurate substitute for PPG. According question 7, we have updated all the replaceable references. Owing to the scarcity of

research literature in the relevant areas, three older references that could not be replaced were retained. Thank you for your correction.

Other changes:

1. We added the article highlights.
2. We modified the supportive foundations.
3. There are a few minor detail changes highlighted in yellow.