

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We have revised the manuscript as suggested and would like to re-submit it for your consideration. We have addressed the editor's and reviewers' comments, and the amendments are highlighted. Point-to-point responses to the comments are listed below. We hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in your esteemed journal. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have further questions.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: A limitation of this study is that the study's Twenty pigs is not a large enough number for data, and if the endoscopist's proficiency is such that 4 perforations occurred in 10 pigs in the control group, I would be concerned about the proficiency of the endoscopist.

Answer: Thank you for your review. I completely agree with your views; however, I would like to share our thoughts regarding the specific comments. This paper is a feasibility verification study rather than a comparative study of effectiveness, and thus, we believe that 20 cases is a sufficient sample size. Furthermore, in this study, our ESD operator is a trainee in endoscopy technology, which may explain the higher perforation rate. However, this does not affect the comparison with the experimental group because the operator was the same for the experimental group and control group. In addition, *in vitro* organs and *in vivo* organs have a greater difference, and the difficulty of ESD operation is significantly increased *in vitro*, which may also explain the high perforation rate. To this end, we have carried out relevant additions and discussions on this issue in the auto-edited manuscript. (Lines 304-310)

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: In this paper, the authors have reported the development of a new traction device designed to support esophageal ESD, which is highly intriguing. However, the overall description falls short of the standards expected of a scientific paper, and the following points require revisions:

Comments: 1) It is essential to provide a comprehensive description of all endoscopic equipment and ESD knives utilized in this study.

Answer: Thank you for your review comments. We added this part in the auto-edited manuscript. (Line 185 and line 189)

2) The paper should include details about the endoscopist's level of experience with ESD. Are they an expert or a trainee?

Answer: In this study, our ESD operators were beginners in endoscopy technology, which has been added in the auto-edited manuscript. (Lines 205-207)

3) The authors need to elucidate the positional relationship and distance between the target magnet (TM) inside the esophagus and the anchor magnet (AM) outside the esophagus. Alternatively, they could include a photograph illustrating the spatial arrangement between TM and AM.

Answer: I completely agree with your opinion, and it is quite unfortunate that we did not take pictures of the spatial position of the anchor magnet and esophagus in the experiment. However, from our description, readers can clearly understand that the target magnet is located in the esophagus, and the anchor magnet is located outside the esophagus. In specific use, the distance between the anchor magnet and esophagus and the spatial position can be flexibly adjusted according to the needs of the traction of the esophageal lesion mucosa to obtain satisfactory traction effect. This part is described in lines 225-235.

4) Diagrams or photographs illustrating the device's capacity to alter the direction of traction for esophageal ESD should be incorporated.

Answer: We have added these contents in the auto-edited manuscript. (Lines 260-262)

5) Within the results section, the authors should provide succinct descriptions of their findings, divided into various subsections with brief headings.

Answer: I completely agree with your suggestion, and we have made some changes in the auto-edited manuscript. (Lines 220, 236, 246)

6) Drawing from the outcomes of this research, it is important to elaborate on the recommended steps for subsequent studies and the pending challenges that need to be addressed.

Answer: According to your suggestion, we have added this part to the Discussion section in the auto-edited manuscript. (Lines 311-316)