

## Response to the reviewers

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for your time invested in reviewing presented manuscript. We are pleased that you found our manuscript interesting and worthy for publication in your prestigious Journal. Please find our replies to new comments below.

Kind regards,

Anna Mrzljak, MD, PhD

Corresponding author

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The authors performed a review of current opinions regarding the etiology, evaluation, and treatment of persistent ascites after LT. The subject is good and is of interest to the surgical community, the manuscript is well organized and well written. I recommend the authors make a table to summarize the etiology, diagnosis, treatment of different type of persistent ascites after LT (vascular, hepatic and extrahepatic), the table could help readers understand the core content of the review easier.

*Reply: Thank you for your comments and the general approval of the manuscript. Proposed table has been added in the manuscript. The manuscript has been checked for language polishing.*

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:**

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? yes.

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? the key words is long. it should be shorten. tips and splenic artery embolization is kinds of treatment.

*Reply: the key words have been changed while bearing in mind Publisher guidelines that there should be at least 6 key words*

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? it does not include background in abstract

*Reply: Thank you for the comment. Based on the Publisher instructions abstract should be unstructured. Authors believe that the written sentences ("Persistent ascites (PA) after liver transplantation (LT), commonly defined as ascites lasting more than four weeks after LT, can be expected in up to 7 % of patients. Despite being relatively rare, it is associated with worse clinical outcomes, including higher one-year mortality.") at the beginning of the abstract represent adequate background.*

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? it is not study. it does not include the methods

*Reply: That is correct. Based on Publisher guidelines, there is no need for methods in minireview.*

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? it is not study which includes experiments used in

*Reply: That is correct. Based on Publisher guidelines, there is no need for results in minireview.*

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? it does not include discussion

*Reply: That is correct. Based on Publisher guidelines, there is no need for discussion in minireview.*

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? the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient.

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately 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? the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections

12 . the manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? the style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate.

13 the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting

14. the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics specific Comments

To Authors:

FIRST.persistent ascites after LT HAS A HIGHER MORBIDITY AND MORTALITY.hepatic and extrahepatic diseases can cause it. the initial approach to the patient with PA should directed to diagnose a modifiable cause and treat.

*Reply: Unfortunately, we do not understand the comment given. If you could be so kind to elaborate on it so we can perform necessary changes.*

SECOND:The manuscript emphasize causes and management of ascites after liver transplantation

*Reply: That is correct. We present all current regarding this subject. We are again not sure whether there is anything that must be changed. If so, please let us know so we can perform necessary changes.*

third: the limitations of the study and its findings include some retrospective studies . it includes some case reports.

*Reply: We are aware of the mentioned limitations. However, persistent ascites after liver transplantation is a relatively rare complications, and there aren't any randomized controlled trials or meta analysis which would provide harder evidence on how to approach described condition.*