

Round-1:

Dear Editor:

Thank you very much for your letter and the comments from the Editorial Office and the reviewer about our paper submitted to *World Journal of Clinical Cases* (Manuscript NO.: 62181, Case Report). The manuscript entitled “Budd–Chiari syndrome associated with liver cirrhosis: A case report and literature review” by Qiao-Bo Ye, Qin-Feng Huang, Yao-Chang Luo, Yi-Lei Wen, Zi-Kun Chen, Ai-Ling Wei have been revised according to the Editorial Office’s and the reviewer’s comments. We wish it to be reconsidered for publication in *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

A list of changes and responses to Editorial Office’s and reviewer are as follows.

List of Actions

LOA1: The paragraph was added to elucidate the possible cause of the first three-month re-stenosis and the work should be done to maximize treatment efficacy.

LOA2: The manuscript’s language was improved by English language editing agency.

LOA3: We have prepared copies of the approved grant application forms which would be uploaded.

LOA4: The original figures which were prepared and arranged by PowerPoint would be uploaded.

LOA5: We have checked and added all authors, PMID and DOI numbers of all references except the PMID number of reference.

LOA6: All required accompanying documents which related to our manuscript have been prepared and would be uploaded.

To Reviewer #1,

Thank you very much for your kindly comments on our manuscript. Those comments are valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. Based on your suggestions, we carefully revised the manuscript. We are now sending the revised article for your re-consideration to publish in *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

Comment 1: Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Reply 1: Thank you for your evaluation. We will improve the manuscript according to your comments.

Comment 2: Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Reply 2: The language was improved by English language editing agency.

Comment 3: Its better if author explained the possible cause of first 3 month re-stenosis. Is it due to first treatment failure or other factors? This point is crucial for the future direction of treatment or research. To prevent the recurrence, what kind of work up should be done to maximize the treatment efficacy (could be add at discussion heading).

Reply 3: (1) With regard to the possible cause of the first three-month re-stenosis, we concluded that the following causes were possible. First, the diameter of the balloon catheter used in balloon angioplasty is not optimal, and the medical community has not yet set a standard for the size of the balloon in balloon angioplasty. Second, inductive vascular repair after balloon angioplasty resulted in thickening of the intima and proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells in the media. (2) To prevent recurrence, we should maximize treatment efficacy. Specifically, the selection of the balloon diameter is key. It affects the clinical efficacy and the recurrence of postoperative lesions. The selection of the appropriate balloon diameter should be fully evaluated in preoperative planning. During the operation, the surgeon should

fully dilate the stenosis or occlusion of the IVC, tear the septum, and loosen the thickened venous wall and extravascular fibrous connective tissue to improve the efficacy and reduce the postoperative recurrence rate.

Changes in the text: We have added the paragraph to elucidate the possible cause of the first three-month re-stenosis, and the work should be done to prevent the recurrence in the discussion section.

To Editorial Office#,

Thank you very much for your kindly comments and suggestions in our manuscript. We have tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments. We hope that the revised manuscript has come up to the standards expected by *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

(1) Science editor

Comment 1: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the Budd–Chiari syndrome associated with liver cirrhosis. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The scientific quality of this manuscript is good. Its better if author explained the possible cause of first 3-month re-stenosis. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 2 figures. A total of 19 references are cited, including no references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by LetPub was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the written informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, Doctoral Research Start-up Fund of Guangxi University of Chinese Medicine. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC.

Reply 1: Thank you very much for your time and effort on reviewing carefully our manuscript. We have replied the questions raised by the reviewer in the

manuscript.

Changes in the text: We have replied the questions raised by the reviewer in the manuscript.

Comment 2: The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Reply 2: We would provide and upload the copy file of the approved grant documents, including the National Natural Science Foundation of China and Doctoral Research Start-up Fund of Guangxi University of Chinese Medicine.

Changes in the text: We have deleted the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81973742) because of lacking approval document.

Comment 3: The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Reply 3: We have prepared and arranged the figures using PowerPoint according to requirements.

Comment 4: PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

Reply 4: We have checked and added all authors, PMID and DOI numbers of all references except the PMID number of reference 6. The possible reason may be that this article was not included in PubMed. We have downloaded the article and would provide a copy of the first page of the full article.

Changes in the text: We have added the missing DOI numbers in the related reference in the references section.

(2) Company editor-in-chief

Comment 1: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Reply 1: Thank you so much for your time and consideration. We have received the letter for revision, and revised the manuscript according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision.

All in all, thank you very much for your reconsidering our revised manuscript for potential publication in *World Journal of Clinical Cases*. I'm looking forward to hearing from you soon. Correspondence should be addressed to Ai-Ling Wei at the following email address.

Email address: weial@gxtnmu.edu.cn

Best wishes for you

Sincerely yours,

Qiao-Bo Ye, Qin-Feng Huang, Yao-Chang Luo, Yi-Lei Wen, Zi-Kun Chen,
Ai-Ling Wei

Round-2:

Dear Editor:

Thank you so much for your letter and the comment about our paper submitted to *World Journal of Clinical Cases* (Manuscript NO.: 62181, Case Report). We have

thought very carefully about this comment and responded as follows. We hope this will be up to the standard for publication in *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

Comment 1: Thank you for your response, regarding your explanation, are there a future study that should be done to prove your theory on the occurrence of short term re-stenosis?

Reply 1: Thank you very much for your interest in our research.

Yes, it is. There are a future study that should be done to prove the theory on the occurrence of short term re-stenosis. Scientific research are derived from practical problems and difficulties encountered in clinical.

We may design the study as following:

1. Balloons with different diameters were compared to evaluate the clinical efficacy, long-term patency rate and safety.
2. The related experiment research may be carried out to prove that inductive vascular repair resulted in thickening of the intima and proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells in the media. A series of research design, such as the establishment of the model, the selection of the reference index may be involved. The specific research program and planning need to be further formulated. The above is some of the current thinking, it will be great honor if you have any comment or suggestion to us.

Best regards,

Sincerely yours,

Ailing Wei, M.D, Ph.D.

Chief of College of Adult Education
Professor of liver disease
The First Affiliated Hospital
Guangxi University of Chinese Medicine
Nanning, Guangxi, 530023, China.