

Answers for reviewers:

Reviewer 1.

Thank you very much for your relevant and helpful comments.

Title of the study: The previous title did not reflect the research aim or the scope of the work. The title has been changed and simplified. Now it seems to more precisely describe the aim of the study.

Abstract : Method section was added to the abstract body. Also results were shortened, and more summarized.

Introduction : It has been shortened. All parts, which seems to be review of basic knowledge has been removed or shifted to Discussion.

Materials : The aim of the study was to analyze adipokines in cirrhosis. We agree that NAFLD is important chronic liver disease, which may progress to cirrhosis. However, it is very difficult to find patients with cirrhosis clearly defined to NAFLD or NASH. We also agree that the comparison with NAFLD cirrhosis would have added some more information. But pointing to a long time, which is necessary for collection of group with pure NAFLD cirrhosis and the fact that we cannot be sure if there is no influence of some other factors (small amounts of alcohol, drugs, dietary habits, other metabolic diseases) we decided not to include this group of patients.

It is an interesting topic for an additional study.

Discussion: The discussion has been shortened. We removed fragments with detailed review of vaspin action. Also fragments which was more appropriate for review article, describing action of adipokines were removed. We added few information about vaspin in Introduction.

We mentioned in last paragraph that at this point it is difficult to propose vaspin and omentin as a clinical tool to use for predicting or estimating the severity of liver disease. We pointed to several limitations of our study, which may interfere or influence obtained results.

Tables: We agree that especially last table is complicated. We slightly shortened and simplified tables. Moreover, we removed last table (Table 8). Statistically significant correlations were discussed in Results section.

Reviewer 2

Thank you for your detailed and precise comments.

1. Abstract was prepared according to WJG rules. These rules clearly defined, that first paragraph is "Aims". We agree that Methods are necessary in Abstract. Method section was added to the abstract body. Also results were shortened, and more summarized.
2. Introduction has been shortened, and focused on main aspect of the study. All parts, which seems to be review of basic knowledge has been removed or shifted to Discussion. The discussion has been shortened. We removed fragments with detailed review of vaspin action. Also fragments which was more appropriate for review article, describing action of adipokines were removed.
3. Patients were chosen on the Department of Gastroenterology according to exclusion and inclusion criteria, which were described in Materials and Methods section. Patients were not systematically screened for PVT before admission.
4. According to reviewer suggestion the most recent article by Kalambokis et al. was cited and shortly discussed in front of our results.
5. We agree that our results and analysis allowed to find only simple association. This was revealed in additional part considering limitations of the study. Also some other limitations were highlighted in the last part of discussion.
6. Hemostatic tests have been shortly described for better understanding the meaning of these tests.
7. All abbreviations were explained.
8. The cut-offs of MELD and HOMA-IR were The cut-offs for MELD and HOMA-IR were determined on the basis of reviewed recent literature (References 25 and 26).
9. English was revised by English language editing service that specialize in scientific and medical manuscripts (certificated has been attached).