

Reviewer 1

1. *“The suggestions I would like to give in order to improve the manuscript: - the quality of English needs to be improved”*

Answer:

We deeply appreciate your comments. We ran a full spelling check, eliminating grammar and spelling errors, and improving sentence clarity.

2. *“It should be made clear that TIPS may make sense in acute portal vein thrombosis, whereas in chronic thrombosis, it does not add any value, because what sense does it make to attempt the technically difficult task to connect a hepatic vein with an occluded portal vein? “*

Answer:

We thank the reviewer for his valuable suggestion. We added new information regarding TIPS in cirrhotic patients with portal vein thrombosis. Please see page 15, lines 3-6.

3. *“The paper by E. Villa, 2012, Gastroenterology, is vital and should be added to the manuscript”*

Answer:

The reference was added, please see page 10, lines 22-24 and page 23 lines 3-8

Reviewer 2

1. *“The first six paragraphs in “Introduction” should be combined into one paragraph as a general introduction of PVT”.*

Answer:

Thank you for your suggestion. The first 3 paragraphs (prevalence and mechanism of PVT), and the last 3 paragraphs (clinical diagnosis, treatment and aim) were combined, please see page 1.

2. *“Page 7 subtitle “PREVALENCE AND PREDICTORS FOR NON-MALIGNANT PVT...” should better be modulated as “PREVALENCE AND PREDICTORS FOR NON-MALIGNANT PVT: ETIOLOGY OF LIVER CIRRHOSIS” and remove “DOES IT MATTER?”*

Answer:

This has been done. Please see page 7, line 9.

3. *“Page 15 subtitle “UNMET NEEDS. FUTURES PERSPECTIVES” should better be modulated as “FUTURE PERSPECTIVES: UNMET NEEDS”.*

Answer:

This has been done. Please see page 15, line 9.

4. *“There are some spelling errors throughout the manuscript”.*

Answer:

The grammatical and spelling mistakes were corrected.