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Dear editor:

This is the fourth revised version of the submitted article “Assessment of intrahepatic blood flow by Doppler ultrasonography: relationship between the hepatic vein, portal vein, hepatic artery and portal pressure measured intraoperatively in patients with portal hypertension”. First of all, we would say sorry for the carelessness of the data input. The number of large esophageal varices should be 31 and small esophageal varices should be 9.

In Table 1, the patients showed absent esophageal varices should be illustrated in more details. Among these patients, 3 patients only had hypersplenism; 4 patients accepted provisioning surgery because CT showed severe liver cirrhosis by a large number of cirrhotic tubercles; other patients had the history of bleeding but the new evaluation of esophageal varices was not available. It caused some misunderstandings that we put this part of patients into the patients with absent esophageal varices. In the revised version, we revised the not-well-organized category and in the Method Section we illustrated more details about the patients.

We sincerely hope this article is well-organized and could be accepted by your journal. The point-to-point response was attached as followed.

Thank you very much!
Yours sincerely,
Li Zhang

Reviewer: Annalisa Berzigotti
Reviewer’s report:
- Major Compulsory Revisions
The addition of the requested data has improved the quality of the paper. However, after observing the clinical characteristics of the patients (Table 1) I have a major concern on the inclusion criteria: if most patients had no major complications of portal hypertension (most had no or small varices and no or light ascites), which was the indication for shunting surgery? This should be detailed and added to the text.
----- First of all, we would say sorry for the carelessness of the data input. The number of large esophageal varices should be 31 and small esophageal varices should be 9. In Table 1, the patients showed absent esophageal varices should be illustrated in more details. Among these patients, 3 patients only had hypersplenism; 4 patients accepted provisioning surgery because CT showed severe liver cirrhosis by a large number of cirrhotic tubercles; other patients had the history of bleeding but the new evaluation of esophageal varices was not available. It caused some misunderstandings that we put this part of patients into the patients with absent esophageal varices. In the revised version, we revised the not-well-organized category and in the Method Section we illustrated more details about the patients.