Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

June 4, 2020

Dear Editors,

On behalf of all the authors, I would like to thank you for your consideration of this paper. In the revised manuscript you will find the changes that we made in response to the Reviewers. In this response to reviewer letter we also indicated how we have dealt with the Reviewers' comments.

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: -Manuscript_edited.doc).

Title: TIPS for Budd-Chiari syndrome: a comprehensive review.

Authors List: Riccardo Inchingolo, Alessandro Posa, Martin Mariappan, Tiago Kojun Tibana, Thiago Franchi Nunes, Stavros Spiliopoulos and Elias Brountzos

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroeneterology*

Invited Manuscript ID: 03358964

Manuscript NO.: 56150

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewer and Editorial Office's Comments:

Reviewer # 1

Among all the available treatment options for BCS, TIPS has played a pivotal role, with different opinions among the physicians during the last decade. There are many reports of BCS using TIPS treatment; however, there are relatively few reviews on TIPS treatment of BCS. It is very necessary of this review is to summarize

the latest data available in literature, focusing on those regarding the safety and efficacy of TIPS for the treatment of BCS and to discuss unresolved issues and future perspectives. This review has the following characteristics: 1.The structure and language of this review are well organized and can clearly explain the points; 2. It is recommended that the author make a simple explanation of the differences between BCS and SOS in pathology, clinical and imaging diagnosis. The differences between BCS and SOS is essential. But in China, many clinicians do not yet have a significant understanding of them, always mistaken SOS as BCS. Especially in China, part of it is SOS caused by pyrrolizidine alkaloids related. The treatment of such SOS does not care whether the hepatic vein is opened or not. 3.After minor revisions, I suggest that the article can be accepted for publication.

A: Thank you for the consideration of this paper and for your comment. A new paragraph about the differences between BCS and SOS has been added.

Science Editor:

1 Scientific quality: This is a review of the TIPS for Budd-Chiari syndrome. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade A; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: There are many reports of BCS using TIPS treatment, however, there are relatively few reviews on TIPS treatment of BCS. It is very necessary of this review is to summarize the latest data available in literature, focusing on those regarding the safety and efficacy of TIPS for the treatment of BCS and to discuss unresolved issues and future perspectives. It is recommended that the author make a simple explanation of the differences between BCS and SOS in pathology, clinical and imaging diagnosis. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 2 tables and 3 figures. A total of 90 references are cited, including 15 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. The authors provided a personal language certificate. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest

Disclosure Form. The authors need to provide the Copyright License Agreement signed by all authors. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. The highest single-source similarity index in the CrossCheck report showed to be 7%. According to our policy, the overall similarity index should be less than 30%, and the single-source similarity should be less than 5%. Please rephrase these repeated sentences.

A: Thank you for the consideration of this paper and for your comment. The sentences highlighted in the CrossCheck report have been rephrased.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study is without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has published 5 articles in the BPG. 5 Issues raised: I found the authors did not provide the original figures. 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. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

A: A new file with .ppt extension has been added, including original figures.

Editorial Office Director

I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

A: Thank you for the consideration of this paper and for your comment.

Company Editor-in-Chief

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 Gastroenterology, 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.

A: Thank you for the consideration of this paper and for your comment.

Finally, we wish to thank the Editor and the Reviewer for their comments that helped us to increase the value of our paper.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Riccardo Inchingolo, MD, EBIR, CIRSE Fellow

Radiologia Diagnostica ed Interventistica

Ospedale Madonna delle Grazie

Matera