

Reviewer #1: The title of this manuscript is the high-resolution colonic manometry and its clinical application in patients with colonic dysmotility: a systematic review. In this study, the authors reviewed that colonic motility, manometry, operation, and motor patterns, and the clinical application of HRCM. And further, they described the limitations, future directions, and potential usefulness of HRCM in the evaluation of clinical treatment effects. Overall, the study is well designed and it should be published in the journal.

RE: Thank you for your appreciation and acceptance.

Reviewer #2: This is a clear, concise and well-written review article on clinical applications of high-resolution colonic manometry.

RE: Thank you for your review and evaluation.

Reviewer #3: It is a mere list of the available literature, which is dispersive and of little use. The usefulness of such revision articles is scarce without the description of clinical cases and without the explanation of the path that led to the resolution of the problems that occurred.

RE: We have added the description of some clinical cases in the section of **clinical application** marked with red.

Reviewer #4: This is an excellent review of colonic motility, defecation, and the use of colonic manometry to diagnose problems with motility and to ascertain if the pathological colon is potentially amenable to treatment. I have no significant criticisms of the manuscript. I make one minor revision request, followed by a suggestion that is optional - not obligatory to do. The minor revision is with the writing. While most of the English usage is excellent, occasionally there are sentences such as: "Also, the microbiome lived in the colon being hugely important in the organisms' homeostasis." that need to be edited. So, the required revision is simply a small amount of editing of the writing. As regards an optional suggestion -the authors may consider including a figure that summarizes the major colonic motility activities, their function, possibly pathology, etc, and how manometry reads the contractile movements. That is simply a suggestion, it is not a required revision.

RE: Thank you for your excellent suggestion. We have revised the sentence "Also, the microbiome lived in the colon being hugely important in the organisms' homeostasis" marked with red in the section of introduction. We also have conducted the writing by native English editing.

Editor's suggestions:

1) Please revise the manuscript according to the review report and my comments. And answer all of the reviewers' comments carefully (point-to-point).

RE: We have revised the manuscript according to the review report and the editor's suggestions carefully. All the revisions are marked with red.

2) Also, please check and revise the manuscript according to the CrossCheck report.

RE: We have carefully checked and revised our manuscript marked with red, according to the CrossCheck report.

3) Your article must be supplemented with pictures or tables to be accepted.

RE: Our manuscript is a review, while the manuscript type of our article was “CASE REPORT” written in your report “48216-edited”. We wonder whether the revised manuscript must be supplemented with the pictures or tables.

4) You need to provide the grant application form(s) or certificate of funding agency for every grant, or we will delete the part of "Supported by...".

RE: We have deleted the part of "Supported by..." in the revised manuscript due to the lack of grant certificate of funding.

5) Please check and confirm that there are no repeated references.

RE: We have checked and confirmed no repeated references in the revised manuscript.