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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors deserve credit in successful management of the index case. They have highlighted their case well, but lacks supportive images and videos of the Stenting. I have following concerns:-
1) Don't use the word "intestinal swelling" looks rather unscientific and naive. instead you may use intestinal edema or bowel wall edema
2) This line in the case presentation section is very confusing 'The patient was later diagnosed with AT-II deficiency and was transfused with plasma to rescue sensitivity to heparin'. I suggest rewriting it and clarifying it for the readers.
3) What was the rationale of aptt of 35-40 sec? has it been used before or validated ?
4) The supporting image of the stent and portal venogram is of poor quality. replace it with good quality images and cines.
5) The discussion is written in variable tense throughout. maintain one tense throughout. Preferably the past tense. Overall the quality of English language used is poor and needs to be edited by an expert.
6) Discuss on the patency rates of these stents. The recommended anti-platelet/ anti-coagulant therapy in the long term.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The revised paper looks better than before. Authors have satisfactorily responded to most of the concerns raised during the prior review. The manuscript will still need some language editing before it’s ready for publication.