Answering reviewers

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

We appreciate your time spent on reviewing our manuscript. We attempted to revise our manuscript according to your suggestions. Please see below for specific comments.

Step 2

(3) Special requirements for figures: Figures must be presented in the order that they appear in the main text of the manuscript (numbered as 1, 2, 3, etc.). The requirements for the figures and figure legends include: (A) All submitted figures, including the text contained within the figures, must be editable. Please provide the text in your figure(s) in text boxes; (B) For line drawings that were automatically generated with software, please provide the labels/values of the ordinate and abscissa in text boxes; (C) Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (D) In consideration of color-blind readers, please avoid using red and green for contrast in vector graphics or images.

We captured a radiological figure and a statistical figure with pre-made text within figures made by software; therefore, we are not able to make the text editable. We changed the color to avoid red and green contrast. (Figure 1 is not editable, but Fig 2 is editable)

(5) Special requirements for references: Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. The author should provide the first page of the paper without PMID and DOI numbers. NOTE: The PMID is required, and NOT the PMCID; the PMID number can be found at https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov. (Please begin with PMID:) The DOI number can be found at http://www.crossref.org/SimpleTextQuery/. (Please begin with DOI: 10.**).

We Added PubMed numbers and DOI as requested.

Step 4

Information provided is correct.

Step 5

Reviewer #1

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

This paper focus into the analysis of the relationship between re-LT and sarcopenia. The fact that sarcopenia has a negative impact on the prognosis of cirrhotic patients and predicts worse outcomes in the first LT is very well described, and the paper does a great job on summarizing the available data on the subject in the introduction. The methods are as expected for such study. Results are well displayed and clear. Tables and figures are ok. The discussion is short, but there are a few studies directly aimed at this subject. I suggest publication after a minor revision: A recent article has developed MELD-sarcopenia. I would like to know if this could predict mortality in this population: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4816259/.

Thank you so much for the suggestion. Montano-Loza et al. developed the MELD-Sarcopenia score based on L3 Skeletal Muscle Index rather than the psoas muscle area, which we used in this study. Incorporation of psoas muscle area into the MELD score has not been described, and formula to calculate MELD-Sarcopenia score using psoas muscle area has not been verified. Unfortunately, we are not able to add results for the MELD-Sarcopenia score due to the above reasons.

Step 6

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective cohort study of the liver re-transplantation. The topic is within the scope of the WJH. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This paper focused into the analysis of the relationship between re-LT and sarcopenia. The results were well displayed and clear, but a few studies directly aimed at this subject; and (3) Format: There are 2 tables and 2 figures. A total of 24 references are cited, including 1 reference published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. The authors are from United States. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement.

The STROBE Statement and Institutional Review Board Approval Form are not qualified.

We included the STROBE Statement and Institutional Review Board Approval Form to the submission.

Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJH.

5 Issues raised: (1) 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.

As stated in Step 2 above, we captured a radiological figure and a statistical figure with pre-made text within figures made by software; therefore, we are not able to make the text editable. (Figure 1 is not editable, but Fig 2 is editable)

(2) 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.

We provided PMID and DOI numbers to the reference list on the revision.

6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

(3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report and the full text of the manuscript, of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revision. Before final acceptance, the authors need to meet ethics requirement by submitting correct documents.