

December 9, 2016

Dr. Shui Qiu:
Science Editor, Editorial Office

Dear Dr. Qui:

We have responded to the comments made by our reviewers. Please see the responses below:

Responses to criticism:

Critique from Reviewed by 02938581

Major Comment 1:

The question on why chemoembolization was performed is addressed in the most recent manuscript with "Track Changes." The response to this is that:

Due to the patient's poor physical status and nutrition, liver transplantation was not felt to be ideal in the immediate future. She underwent intense nutritional and physical rehabilitation prior to transplantation to help improve her condition.

Major Comment 2:

The pathologic description has been revised to address the question on the presence of hepatocellular carcinoma and cirrhosis, both of which were noted on explant.

Major Comment 3 and 4:

I stated that this liver transplantation was cadaveric and not living-related.

Critique from Reviewed by 02936735

Major comment 1: I addressed that this child underwent chemembolization given the fact that transplantation was not ideal in the near future, and the lesion was felt to be adjacent to vascular structure.

Critique from Reviewed by 00068723

The authors feel that the relevant laboratory studies were presented in the article, most notably the AFP. If other blood tests were not felt to be relevant. Her ALT was 39, AST 28, and INR 1.03. These did not reflect her immediate need for transplantation.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me via email.

Thank you.

Essam M. Imseis, M.D.