

- Hepatology. 2014;60:362-98.
3. Mali VP, Aw M, Quak SH, Loh DL, Prabhakaran K. Vascular complications in pediatric liver transplantation; single-center experience from Singapore. *Transplant Proc.* 2012;44:1373-8.
 4. Kasahara M, Umeshita K, Inomata Y, Uemoto S; Japanese Liver Transplantation Society. Long-term outcomes of pediatric living donor liver transplantation in Japan: An analysis of more than 2200 cases listed in the registry of the Japanese Liver Transplantation Society. *Am J Transplant.* 2013;13:1830-9.
 5. Byun J, Yi NJ, Lee JM, Suh SW, Yoo T, Choi Y, *et al.* Long term outcomes of pediatric liver transplantation according to age. *J Korean Med Sci.* 2014;29:320-7.

AUTHOR'S REPLY

We appreciate the keen interest of authors of this correspondence in our recent article on outcome of living donor liver transplants. We wish to clarify that while PELD/MELD scores were originally devised to predict mortality over time in patients with chronic liver disease (CLD), they are currently the only objective tool to use as 'minimal listing criteria'. They are important, but are not the only consideration in deciding whether and when to transplant [1]. In our study, we used them as guidelines but not as fixed cut-offs for transplant. In CLD, irrespective of scores, we also factored-in evidence of deteriorating liver function such as poor weight gain, growth failure, recurrent variceal bleeding, intractable ascites, recurrent cholangitis or episodes of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis, pruritus, advancing encephalopathy, and, or uncorrectable coagulopathy, in the decision to transplant [2]. There are several limitations to use of PELD score and conditions in which the PELD score can be adjusted higher. Liver tumors, sick patients in ICU, in metabolic crisis as in Urea cycle defects or Organic acedemia or poor metabolic control necessitating early transplant [2,3]. As ours was a retrospective study, we realized that excluding the above mentioned exceptions, all our patients <12 years who underwent living donor related transplantation for CLD were having a PELD

score >10 and MELD score of >15.

Due to the need of brevity in the published paper, we did not include all long term follow-up issues. PTLD, chronic rejection, recurrence and retransplantation were adequately covered in this paper, and we might publish long-term outcome as a separate paper.

Vascular complications depend on the age of the patient, etiology (such as biliary atresia), post-surgical morbidity and expertise of the surgeon. Our surgical team has a vast experience of nearly 3000 liver transplants now. Modifications in vascular techniques included jump grafts in cases of narrow portal vein, close monitoring by frequent dopplers for portal vein and hepatic artery along with use of prophylactic anticoagulants in high-risk patients. Similar vascular complications rates have been earlier reported from a single, large volume center [4].

NEELAM MOHAN

*Department of Pediatric Gastroenterology,
Hepatology and Liver transplant,
Medanta –The Medicity, Gurgaon, Haryana, India.
drneelam@yahoo.com*

REFERENCES

1. Martin P, DiMartini A, Feng S, Brown R, Fallon M. Evaluation for Liver Transplantation in Adults: 2013 Practice Guideline by the AASLD and the American Society of Transplantation. *Hepatology.* 2014;59:1144-65.
2. Squires RH, Ng V, Romero R, Ekong U, Hardikar W, Emre S, *et al.* Evaluation of the Pediatric Patient for Liver Transplantation: 2014 Practice Guideline by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases, American Society of Transplantation and the North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition. *Hepatology.* 2014;60:362-98.
3. Choi Y, Lee KW, Hong G, Kim H, Park MS, Suh S, *et al.* Status and current problems in the allocation system for pediatric liver transplantation in Korea. *J Korean Soc Transplant.* 2012;26:196-201.
4. Steinbrück K, Enne M, Fernandes R, Martinho JM, Balbi V, Agoglia L, *et al.* Vascular complications after living donor liver transplantation: A Brazilian, single-center experience. *Transplant Proc.* 2011;43:196-8.