

First of all, we would like to express our sincerest gratitude to the reviewers for their constructive and positive comments.

#### Replies to Reviewer 1

1. Diagnostic assesment: please consider providing the data on depth of invasion for pathological specimens. As it is only type of carcinoma is stated.

**Response:** We thank the reviewer for the thoughtful suggestion. The pathological findings of the excised specimen revealed a moderately differentiated squamous cell carcinoma located in the mucosa. The indicated sentence was modified in the revised manuscript to address the raised concern.

2. Interventions: please comment on the site of POEM myotomy in relation to the site of ESD – I suppose the myotomy was done on the opposite side to the lesion?

**Response:** POEM was performed on the opposite side to the lesions. Accordingly, a statement regarding the site of POEM myotomy was added to the interventions described in the revised manuscript.

#### Replies to Reviewer 2

1. Recommend "Slight weight loss" to be re-written as it is not a physical exam finding rather a symptom.

**Response:** We thank the reviewer for the insightful suggestion. Since the slight weight loss recorded for this case was not important to the case presentation, this was removed from the description.

2. Diagnostic assessment: -Why was the manometry done prior to the EGD? The procedures must be described in the order in which they were done.

**Response:** We thank the reviewer for the suggestion. The order of esophageal manometry was modified in the section that addressed the diagnostic assessment in the revised manuscript to address this issue.

3. Was the lesion biopsied or excised? Please clarify and re-write this part.

**Response:** We thank the reviewer for raising this critical issue. The pathological

results were obtained from the resected specimens. This result was restated, and the order was adjusted to avoid ambiguity.