

Dear Sir,

According to the reviewers` comments we accurately addressed all points step by step as following:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: see the attachment (Mittermair C and Weiss H surprisingly made an Analogies between Medusa and Single Port Surgery. As we all know, single port surgery is a latest technique leading to esthetic outcomes and enhanced recovery and has become a surgical mainstream, which strikes and pushes all surgical fields.

Two authors narrated largely Medusa as a snake woman fairy to be a powerful magic, her icon is negative in most cases, resembling the history of single port surgery, as an academic paper, it outweighs much. **A lot of grammar and syntax errors existed**)

- We have checked and corrected the entire manuscript for grammar and syntax errors.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript titled “Analogies between Medusa and Single Port Surgery” is a well-written review. But there are some concerns need to be addressed in the present version.

1. Please **rephrase the title** to show the study design (e.g., “A review”), and **add keywords and statement on conflict of interest**.
- The title has been rephrased: Analogies between Medusa and Single Port Surgery in Gastroenterology and Hepatology - A Review (comments of Reviewer#2 and Company editor-in-chief were taken into account).
- Keywords and a statement on conflict of interest have been added (page 1).
2. Please **add citations** into “introduction” and other sections to support your words (e.g., first few paragraphs, “From 2008, delighted by the first scientific reports”, “A low rate of less than 1%”, etc.).
- The citations have been added and or stated as (data submitted for publication).
3. Please **revise the format of the inverted comma** (e.g., under someone’s aegis, Athena’s, single port laparoscopy in Figure 1, 10mm).
- The format of the inverted comma has been revised throughout the manuscript.
4. “**SPS**” in the sentence “...emphasize several parallels between single-port surgery (SPS)...” **has occurred in the first paragraph**.

- This has been corrected “... emphasize several parallels between SPS ...”.
5. Please give the full name of **SIL, RCTs, taTME, eTEP, etc.**
 - The abbreviations have been clarified throughout the manuscript: SIL has been replaced by SPS (page 6, line15; page 7, line 17; page 23, table 1), RCTs has been replaced by randomised controlled trials (page 7); taTME has been clarified: “...transanal total mesorectal rectal excision (taTME)...“ (page 11); eTEP has been clarified: “... abdominal wall reconstruction (e.g. SPS-enhanced view total extraperitoneal Patch hernia repair; eTEP)“ (page 11)
 6. Please **revise the number and format of citations** to comply with the BPG format.
 - This has been corrected accordingly.
 7. Please **report the limits and data** for the search for “single port laparoscopy”. In particular, a search without restriction may include “conference abstracts”, “corrections”, and “retractions”.
 - The limits and data have been reported in the figure legend as: “...PubMed timeline results per year (search query “single port laparoscopy“, article type “journal articles, classical articles, letters, multicenter studies, case reports“).
 8. Please **add a full stop for the legend of the Figure 1 and Figure 2**, respectively.
 - A full stop for the legends has been added (pages 18 and 19)
 9. Please report the **statistical method** for Mean procedural times.
 - The statistical method is now given in the figure legend (page 22)
 10. Please **prettify the Table 1 and add the specific surgical methods** in line of “Other procedures”.
 - Table 1 has been prettified and “Other procedures“ were given in the legend (page 23)

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The author presents a very interesting and relevant topic in these times. Honestly, the work is very well developed. I suggest priority for its publication, since it provides a new vision for the surgical community.

Company Editor-in-Chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

1. The author(s) must include the keyword “**Gastric or intragastric resections**” in the manuscript title.

- The title has been rephrased: Analogies between Medusa and Single Port Surgery in Gastroenterology and Hepatology - A Review (comments of Reviewer#2 and Company editor-in-chief were taken into account)
2. Please submit your **recent professional Photo**. The image must be a JPG file. The photo size will be 48 mm in height and 33 mm in width, and at a resolution of 200 dpi.
- The Photo is submitted as required

After completing all revisions we hope that the manuscript in its present form will be suitable to be published in your excellent journal.

Sincerely

Prof Helmut Weiss