

Dear editors and reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers comments on our manuscript entitled "Simultaneous partial splenectomy during liver transplantation for advanced cirrhosis patients combined with severe splenomegaly and hypersplenism . (Manuscript Number: 59789). Those comments are very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied the comments carefully and made corrections. The main corrections are in the manuscript and the responds to the reviewers comments are as follows(the replies are highlighted in blue).

Replies to the Reviewer and Editor comments:

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer# 1

Specific Comments to Authors: 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes, Title clear and complete 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? **They are missing** 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? The state of the art and the meaning of the study are well explained in the introduction 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Almost. The patients are divided in to two groups: LT with or without partial splenectomy. **Were they randomized? Or: what criteria were used to assign a patient to one of the two groups? Fig. 3A and 3B are not cited in the text** 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? **In table 2 (donor characteristics) 11 cases of brain tumour: which histological type?** Results are clear and support the hypothesis of the study even if the cohort of patients is not wide enough to consider fully demonstrated the thesis of the authors 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? The discussion is accurate and exhaustive as well as relevant from a clinical point of view 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? They are OK 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes Performing partial splenectomy associated with LT seems to be an interesting therapeutic

option for OLT candidates with cirrhosis and splenomegaly. The results of the study seem to support the choice of partial splenectomy even if the limited number of cases enlisted does not allow a validation of the procedure. **A revision of the English language is necessary to make the text more smooth and correct**

Response: We feel great thanks for your professional reminding. We have made modifications as follow:

“3 Key words.They are missing.”Key words has been added on page 5.

“5 Methods.The patients are divided in to two groups: LT with or without partial splenectomy. Were they randomized?” Yes, they are randomized.

“5 Methods. Fig. 3A and 3B are not cited in the text.” Thank you for your reminding, we added them on page 8.

“6 Results. In table 2 (donor characteristics) 11 cases of brain tumour: which histological type?” All brain tumour cases were glioma, we have revised it in Table 2.

“A revision of the English language is necessary to make the text more smooth and correct.” We have revised the language again to make the text more smooth and correct. Thank you for your professional comment.

Editor comments:

Science editor:

5 Issues raised: (1) I found 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); (2) 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; (3) I found the authors did not add the PMID in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; (4) The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces; and (5) Please don't include any *, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @....in your manuscript; Please use superscript numbers for illustration.

Response: We feel great thanks for your professional reminding. We have made modifications as follow:

(1) We have uploaded the funding agency copy, thank you for your help.

(2) We have prepared the original figures by using PowerPoint, thank you for your help.

(3) We have added the PMID in the reference list, thank you for your help.

(4) We have superscripted the reference numbers in square brackets, thank you for your help.

(5) We have deleted *, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @.... in the manuscript, thank you for your help.

Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the 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. **Before its final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the Chinese version of the ethical approval document.**

Response:

We have uploaded the Chinese version of the ethical approval document. Thank you very much for your constructive comments and suggestions which would help us both in English and in depth to improve the quality of the paper.

Kind regards.

Zhongyang Shen, Jian Yang

E-mail: jiang-wentao@medmail.com.cn; yangjian0628@126.com

Corresponding author : Zhongyang Shen

E-mail address: jiang-wentao@medmail.com.cn; yangjian0628@126.com