

## Answers to the reviewers' comments

### Reviewer 1:

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? The title is completely reflective of the topic. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes, the abstract explains the topic well. 3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes, the introduction is well explained. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? The method could be more complete, but it is acceptable for now. 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? The results were well presented. 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 was well described. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? Yes, interesting pictures were used to explain the topic. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Not applicable. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes. 11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? The manuscript was carefully written and grammatically it is at a good level. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable? Yes. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the

manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Not applicable. Reviewer's comments: 1)Your article was carefully written, although a few minor errors with red lines in the pdf file were corrected. 2)The method was concise, which was acceptable considering the type of study. My suggestion for your next projects is to use a systematic review method and describe it entirely in the article. Your article could easily become a scoping review, which has a higher position in the Evidence hierarchy. However, this study is very well done and can be published in its current state.

- **We thank the reviewer for the detailed review and the thoughtful suggestions. The edits mentioned in the PDF file has now been incorporated in the manuscript and marked in red for easy identification.**

#### **Reviewer 2:**

The authors describe current clinically important issues and future directions regarding endoscopic ultrasound-guided vascular intervention. This is an interesting report and well written; however, it seems to be required some minor revisions. 1 . The description of the puncture needle is better to unify them (example "25 G" and "25-G"). 2 . In section V.C. of the main text, it is abbreviated as "TIPSS", but it seems to be a mistake of "TIPS".

- **We thank the reviewer for the detailed review. The changes suggested has now been incorporated in the manuscript and marked in red for easy identification.**