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Dear Colleague,

RE: Splenic infarction complicating percutaneous transluminal coeliac artery stenting for chronic mesenteric ischaemia: A case report

Please find attached our modified version, which addresses each of the points raised by the reviewers, as set-out point-by-point below. Each of these changes have been highlighted in bold text for your convenience in the revised version.

Reviewer L. Brandt

1. We have detailed the weight loss from what to what – this is found on page 3, paragraph 2, line 3.

2. We have added the other signs that were sought, in particular the absence of any tenderness or organomegaly – this is found on page 3, paragraph 2, from line 5.

3. Stool testing for occult blood was performed and proved negative – this is found on page 3, paragraph 2, from line 6.

4. We have added more detail about the CT scan, in particular that there were no abnormalities of hollow or solid viscera – this is found on page 3, paragraph 2, from line 12.

5. We have provided the lab data requested – page 3, paragraph 2, from line 8.

6. The coeliac artery was stented with the intention of later stenting of the superior mesenteric artery as well, should flow in this artery arising from collaterals from a revascularised coeliac artery not be evident. In fact, coeliac artery stenting did result in demonstrable filling of the superior mesenteric artery via collaterals, thus obviating the need for additional stenting of the superior mesenteric artery – these details are found on page 4, paragraph 2, from line 2 and again from line 16.

7. We have added the manufacturer of the stent – page 4, paragraph 2, line 6.
8. The CT scan was performed 18 hours post-procedure; the reference to 48 hours in the original manuscript was a typographical error for which we apologise – the text has been modified on page 4, paragraph 2, line 10.

9. The pain resolved after 6 days – page 5, paragraph 1, from line 3.

10. We have updated the reference list – all references are now from 2000 or later.

**Reviewer Pankaj Kaul**

No revisions suggested

**Reviewer Vinay Dhir**

1. We have provided details concerning the manufacturer of the stent - page 4, paragraph 2, line 6.

2. The two year follow-up included progress Doppler analysis, which demonstrated ongoing patency of the stent – page 5, paragraph 1, from line 6.

We trust that we have satisfactorily addressed the various comments of the reviewers.

We will look forward to hearing further from you in due course and having our manuscript published in your journal.

Yours sincerely,

**Stephen Riordan**