Reviewer 02439165 comments:

"The paper described a novel technique using endoscopic mucosal ablation to remove polyps of the colon, especially for wide based polyps. From the limited number of case series, the authors concluded the technique is safe, feasible and easy to master".

Authors reply: Since no changes were suggested by the reviewer we kindly thank him/her for the kind review.

Reviewer 03647305 comments:

"good work".

Authors reply: Since no changes were suggested by the reviewer we kindly thank him/her for the kind review.

Reviewer 04213276 comments:

"Although the technique has a significant drawback that may diminish its use in clinical practice (absence of tissue for histology after the removal), it is a valuable addition to the therapeutic management of colonic adenoma, especially in practices where ESD is not available".

Authors reply: Since no changes were suggested by the reviewer we kindly thank him/her for the kind review.

Science editor comments:

"1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the endoscopic mucosal ablation for colon polyps. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade B, Grade B and Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The paper described a novel technique using endoscopic mucosal ablation to remove polyps of the colon, especially for wide based polyps. From the limited number of case series, the authors concluded the technique is safe, feasible and easy to master. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 6 figures. A total of 8 references are cited, including 1 reference published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A, Grade B and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the CARE Checklist–2016. The authors

need to provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, and informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has published 1 article in the BPG. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found no "Author contribution" section. Please provide the author contributions; (2) Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (3) I found the "Case Presentation" did not meet our requirements. Please re-write the "Case Presentation" section, and add "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" section to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision; (10) the author should number the references in Arabic numerals according to the citation order in the text. The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted".

Authors reply: We kindly thank the science editor for his/her comments. Here is our point by point reply. A Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form, Copyright License Agreement, and informed consent documents have been added to the submission. 1)An author contribution section has been added to the manuscript. 2)All original figure files have been added and modified in powerpoint as requested. 3)The case presentation has been reformatted to include all required sections including final diagnosis, treatment and outcome and follow-up". 10) All references have been numbered, superscripted in square brackets at the endo of the sentence or after the cited authors name with no spaces.

Company editor-in-chief comments:

"I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to

the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...".

Authors reply: We kindly thank the science editor for his/her comments. Here is our point by point reply. All figures have been modified as per his/her recommendations.