

June 25, 2018

Dear editor

We 'd like to thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript.

We tried to revise it according to the major issues suggested.

You can find our answers on the table below.

Nine manuscripts, which included a total of 1034 PLT in 991 subjects, were included in this systematic review (Table 1). None of the studies fulfilled the pre-defined requirements to be considered at low risk of bias (Table 2). In particular, no study was prospective, only 7 studies reported thrombosis as a pre-defined outcome, and 8 studies clearly reported information on how the diagnosis of thrombosis had been made. Therefore, the overall quality of studies was poor. This condition and the heterogeneity of included studies did not allow us to perform a pooled analysis of results from all included studies. Fort this reason a biomedical statistics was not invited.

We hope you can accept our revision.

On behalf of all coauthors

Best regards

Dr. Nacoti Mirco

| REVIEWER 1   | ANSWER                            |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| This is a valuable systematic review in an important area. Thrombosis in pediatric liver transplantation remains a problem and every insight into the area is precious. The study reached an important | No specific revision is required. |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>conclusion that the level of current evidence is low and that more-quality studies are necessary in the future.</p>  |  |
| <p>REVIEWER 2</p>   |  |
| <p>Special comments to authors: First, what are the original findings of this manuscript? What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study? Reduced size liver transplant was associated with a low risk of both PVT (incidence 4%) and HAT (incidence 0%, <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>). Similarly, aortic arterial anastomosis without graft interposition and microsurgical hepatic arterial reconstruction were associated with a significantly reduced HAT incidence (6% and 0%, respectively). Second, what are the quality and importance of this manuscript? What are the new findings of this study? What are the new concepts that this study proposes? What are the new methods that this study proposed? Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? What are the unique insights that this study presented? What are the key problems in this field that this</p> | <p>No specific revision is required.</p> <p>This is a systematic review of the literature prepared and revised according to the PRISMA 2009 Checklist. Limitations of the study depends only on the poor quality of primary studies found in the literature.</p> <p>All answer to the questions are included in the study.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>study has solved? The manuscript is good quality. Authors described some ways to reduce risk of PVT and HAT by surgical means. Third, what are the limitations of the study and its findings? What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next? How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice? Authors described by themselves limitations of the study: retrospective, they used poor quality studies in their systematic review; they do not describe statistical methods used for data analysis. Prospective study is necessary.</p> |  |
| <p>REVIEWR 3</p>   |  |
| <p>This is the systematic review to review current literature of thrombosis prophylaxis in pediatric liver transplantation. They analyse 9 studies but they could not find any prospective study but only retrospective studies. They concluded that prospective studies are urgently needed. This paper was well written and their topic is quite original and important in this field. But, unfortunately, thier aim of the study was not achieved by</p>  | <p>Results of the systematic review depends on the quality of the primary studies. As the quality of the primary studies is poor, our conclusion may appear so weak. Nevertheless, as the first reviewer says "The study reached an important conclusion that the level of current evidence is low and that more-quality</p> |

this. Of course they can provide us their efforts and results, but the impact of this study on current literature is quite small. Only one thing I can add is that your discussion should be based on your findings.

studies are necessary in the future”.

No specific revision is required.

We revise discussion based on findings.