Respond to the reviewer

Dear editor and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "**Prevention of late complications of endoscopic resection of colorectal lesions with a coverage agent: Current status of gastrointestinal endoscopy**" (**Manuscript number: 69281**). These comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper and the essential guiding significance to our research. We have studied comments carefully and have made a correction which we hope meet with approval. We have revised and resubmit the revised manuscript. The major corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewer's comments are as follows:

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer 1

1. In the Abstract part, what does large non-Amputated Colorectal Lesions mean? Are the authors misspelling the word large non-pedunculated colorectal lesions?

Author response and action taken: We are very sorry for our misspelling the word large non-pedunculated colorectal lesions. We have replaced "non-Amputated Colorectal Lesion" with "large non-pedunculated colorectal lesions" in the original text

2. In the text 'to the editor,' When other papers are marked as author et al., the author's last name is usually cited, and the full name is not used. The authors will need corrections. (eg Lorenzo-Zúñiga, Vicente et al.) In the

fourth paragraph of the main text, "We agree with Lorenzo-Zúñiga, Vicente et al., who reported that the routine use of prophylactic clipping does not reduce the risk of post-procedural bleeding overall and needs to focus on the economic efficiency ratio" The above sentence needs to be quoted again.

Author response and action taken: We are very sorry for our negligence that the author's full names are used when citing articles. We have revised these citations to only cite the author's last name.

3. In the fourth paragraph of the main text, What does non-truncated lesions mean? Doesn't that mean non-pedunculated here too?

Author response and action are taken: non-truncated and non-pedunculated mean the same thing, but they are expressed differently.

4. Where is Figure 1 cited in the text? Suddenly, a figure enters without explanation. The abstract, core tip, and conclusion of the text are all expressed in slightly different expressions, so it is not clear what the authors want to convey to the readers through this 'To the editor'. The authors will need to unify the point on this. Thanks.

Author response and action taken: We are very sorry for our negligence that we have not cited Fig.1 in the text. We have cited Fig. 1 in the text and a detailed explanation of Fig.1. We have unified the different parts of the abstract, core tip, and conclusion of the text.

Reviewer 2

I reviewed Letter to editor 'Prevention of late complications of endoscopic resection of colorectal lesions with a coverage agent: Current status of gastrointestinal endoscopy' The author is well documented about some shortcomings of the prevention of DB and DP with coverage agents after EMR or ESD. It's suitable for accepting. Minor There are typographical errors (nonamputated) in abstract and key words. Author response: Thanks for your comments.

Re-reviewer

Thank you for your efforts in revising the manuscript. In particular, it is judged that the part mentioned by the reviewer has been appropriately revised. Author response: Thanks for your comments. Thank you very much for your meticulous work.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Issues raised: (1) The manuscript exist some spell and format errors in main text, punctuation error in Figure Legends section.

Author response and action taken: We have corrected the spelling and format errors in the text. The punctuation error in Figure Legends section also has corrected.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Yours sincerely, Deng-Hai Mi <u>mi.dh@outlook.com</u>