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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:

Consent for publication

In this section, please clarify whether consent to publish were obtained from all the patients (recipient and donors).

Response to editor comments –

Dear Editors,

We are most grateful to you and the reviewers for the helpful comments on the original version of our manuscript. We have taken all the comments into consideration and are submitting a revised version of our work. Point-by-point responses to each of the concerns raised are given below.
We hope that you will find the revised version of our manuscript suitable for publication in the BMC Surgery, and we look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Dr Vinayak Nikam
Institute of HPB Surgery and Transplantation,
Global Hospital, 35,
Dr E Borges Road
Opp. Shirodkar High School, Parel,
Mumbai, Maharashtra, India, 400012
vinayaknikam7183@gmail.com
vinayak_nikam@yahoo.com

Response to editor comments –

All patients (recipient and donors) had given consent for publication. Also We have mentioned and completed the declaration form.

Reviewer reports:

Florin Botea (Reviewer 1): This is a well written paper on a very interesting and rare topic, dual LDLT.

However, 2 things need to be better clarified:

1. The volumetry of the left lateral lobe (donor 2): preoperatively was 295g (GRWR 0.32) and intraoperatively was 374g (GRWR 0.41). This is very strange (actual volume being significantly larger than estimated) and should be commented on, as usualy the difference in volume is oposite (the actual volume is underestimated preoperatively).

2. Intraoperative aspects with the anastomosis (at least a drawing, if not the actual pictures)
Minor issues:

- An image with the bile ducts in donor 2 is not included in the paper

- A comment about the possibility to use reversed left lobe (instead of the right lobe); using left lobe from both donor may have been feasible in this case.

In conclusion, I consider that the paper may be considered for publishing after revision.

Dear Dr Botea,

We thank the reviewers for their comments. Please see below specific responses to each of the points raised by the reviewers.

Response to First Reviewer

1) We completely agree with your observation that Right and left lobes estimated graft weight (EGW) on CT Volumetry is overestimated as compare to Actual graft weight (AGW). But for LLS graft, CT may underestimate the volume because actual surgical plane of transection is around 1 cm to the right of falciform ligament whereas radiological plane is at falciform ligament. In addition to that non-hepatic tissues like falciform ligament which are excluded in CT volumetry are a part of LLS allograft included in AGW.


2) As per your recommendation, we tried to search more actual intraoperative pictures but unfortunately we have only one actual intraoperative picture which is already a part of submitted manuscript.

Minor issues

a) As per your suggestion - Donor 2 MRCP image (Bile Duct Image) is included.

b) In this case it was possible to use reversed left lobe graft. However we chose Right lobe graft over left lobe as we have maximum experience in Right Lobe LDLT. We have 100% safety record for all our Right lobe donors (220 Cases). Moreover reverse left dual graft surgery is technically challenging and associated with more complications.
Paolo Magistri (Reviewer 2): Authors reported a case of dual living donation for liver transplantation. It is a very interesting case, a didactic and detailed description of the decision-making process has been reported, along with a precise discussion on relevant issues on the topic, including the ethical implications.

At this time the paper would benefit from an extensive English revision and more detailed intraoperative pictures.

Response to second Reviewer

Dear Dr Magistri,

Thank you for your expert and helpful comment on our manuscript. As suggested we have added a diagram for intra-operative implantation. The intra-operative picture is already a part of submitted manuscript. Unfortunately we don’t have more intra operative pictures. Also as per your recommendation we have revised the English language.

If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE_BS) for help with English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and our Writing resources (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

---------------------

Editorial Policies

---------------------

Please read the following information and revise your manuscript as necessary. If your manuscript does not adhere to our editorial requirements, this may cause a delay while this is addressed. Failure to adhere to our policies may result in rejection of your manuscript.

In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies and formatting guidelines, all manuscript submissions to BMC Surgery must contain a Declarations section which includes the mandatory
sub-sections listed below. Please refer to the journal's Submission Guidelines web page for information regarding the criteria for each sub-section (https://bmcsurg.biomedcentral.com/).

Where a mandatory Declarations section is not relevant to your study design or article type, please write "Not applicable" in these sections.

For the 'Availability of data and materials' section, please provide information about where the data supporting your findings can be found. We encourage authors to deposit their datasets in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate), or to be presented within the manuscript and/or additional supporting files. Please note that identifying/confidential patient data should not be shared. Authors who do not wish to share their data must confirm this under this sub-heading and also provide their reasons. For further guidance on how to format this section, please refer to BioMed Central's editorial policies page (see links below).

Declarations

- Ethics approval and consent to participate
- Consent to publish
- Availability of data and materials
- Competing interests
- Funding
- Authors' Contributions
- Acknowledgements

All sections of declaration form are completed as per editorial Policies.