

Dear editor:

Thank you very much for your letter and the comments from reviewers about our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to the comments. The revised parts have been marked with red text.

Detailed responses to comments from reviewers are as follows:

Reviewer 1:

Please remove "and so on" from the first sentence of your INTRODUCTION. It is totally imprecise. It is unclear how your study differs from that in reference 1: "excellent results" is an inadequate comment. Under STENT PATENCY AND PATIENT SURVIVAL you state "a trend of later occurrence of stent dysfunction", it would be better to point out the relative times as the difference is impressive though not statistically significant due to your limited patient numbers. Remove "in theory" from the first paragraph in DISCUSSION I was unable to view the video in the submission.

Thanks to the reviewer's comments and suggestions. We have removed "and so on" from the first sentence of INTRODUCTION, and removed "in theory" from the first paragraph in DISCUSSION. In our study, we developed a new antireflux plastic stent (ARPS) with a "duckbilled" valve made of silicone rubber material, while the study by Leong et al. (reference 1), an ARPS with a collapsible antireflux sleeve made of polytetrafluoroethylene was reported. The shape and material of these valves are different. Moreover, our study showed that the new ARPS had the potential advantage of prolonging stent patency markedly, but all their ARPS were occluded within 30 days. We have revised "excellent results" to "good results". We have also added some sentences to declare the difference in stent patency between the two groups. The details are as follows: "In patients with stent dysfunction, the median stent patency in ARPS group was 64 days longer than that in TPS group. Although the difference was not statistically significant due to the limited sample size, the difference was impressive. In all patients enrolled in this study, the median patency of this new ARPS was 285 days, which was significantly longer than 130 days observed for the TPS". We have resubmitted the Video and maybe it

could be viewed.

Reviewer 2:

This paper is reported the new type of plastic stent. This stent patency is very long. This study is well considered and well performed. Next large scale sample study(Phase 3) is necessary to show the real usefulness of the newly designed stent.

Thanks to the reviewer's comments and suggestions. We are conducting a clinical trial with a large number of patients to show the real usefulness of this new antireflux plastic stent.