

Dear Editor and Reviewers

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and offering valuable advice.

We have addressed your comments with point-by point responses, and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Reviewer 1)

- Polypectomy should be described as hot snare polypectomy.

→As the reviewer pointed out, all the procedures were hot and this study did not include cold polypectomy. We corrected the description regarding this matter (P6, line 8 from the bottom).

- The cause for PPB should be explained in detail. The mechanism of PPB that authors speculate should be added.

→Our speculation about the mechanism of PPB was added in the discussion section (P9, lines 9-14).

Reviewer 2)

In the patients who had stopped anticoagulation, had soon had they restarted anticoagulation after procedure?

→All antiplatelets and anticoagulants were resumed 24 to 48 hours from polypectomy (P6, lines 15-16).

Reviewer 3)

① In table2, did the patients in “antiplatelets + heparin bridge” and “anticoagulants + heparin bridge” take antiplatelets or anticoagulants during heparin bridge?

→All anticoagulants and antiplatelets were ceased before starting heparin. As the description “antiplatelets plus heparin” might be misleading, an explanation was added in the results section (P7, lines 17-18).

② ESD cases should be excluded for this analysis.

→We included ESD in this study because it was one of our concerns whether delayed bleeding is more frequent in ESD than in the conventional methods (polypectomy and EMR). As our study demonstrated that bleeding rates

were similar between the 2 groups, we believe that the ESD data does not influence the results.

③In table2, the number of patients in this study is 759. But the numbers of “polyp location, “polyp size”, “Prophylactic clipping” are inconsistent.

→In table 2, total numbers of polyp location and polyp size were smaller than the number of patients (788) because we could not identify location and size of some polyps from the endoscopy reports.

The numbers of patients with the use of antithrombotic agents are different from those of table2.

→As the reviewer pointed out, we corrected the number of main texts.

④The results of univariate analysis should be shown in Table3

→The results of univariate analysis were demonstrated in table 2.

Did the authors perform the analysis of risk factors for PPB per polyp or per patient?

→Risk factors regarding patients’ characteristics such as age, gender and antithrombotic agents were analyzed per patient while those about polyps’ characteristics such as size, location and shape were analyzed per polyp.

⑤Recently, Ishigami et al. reported the incidence and characteristics of PPB in heparin bridging therapy. The authors should perform the analysis among patients with heparin bridging therapy.

→Additional analysis was performed to speculate whether there were any risk factors for PPB during heparin bridging therapy. Like the recent study by Ishigami et al., none of following factors was not associated PPB during heparin-bridge; location, size and shape of polyp, number of polyps resected, and prophylactic clipping. We quote this article in the discussion section (P8, lines 16-17).