The peer reviews made issues and I responded as follows:

Reviewer 1:

Question1. If you agree, I advise that the title "Evaluation of the efficacy and safety of endoscopic reversal body ligation in the treatment of mild to moderate type 1 gastric variceal hemorrhage" should be simplified, e.g. "Evaluation of the efficacy and safety of endoscopic band ligation in the treatment of bleeding from mild to moderate gastric varices type 1 ".

Answer：I agreed with this suggestion and changed the title.

Question2. In the entire manuscript, the term "reversal body ligation" should be replaced by "band ligation".

Answer：I agreed with this suggestion and changed the words.

Question3. The authors do not refer to Figures 1 and 2 in the text.

Answer：I refered the Figures 1 and 2 in the RESULTS.

Question4. The term "hemorrhage from dehiscence" needs to be further clarified or replaced.

Answer: The term "hemorrhage from dehiscence" means “hemorrhage from dislodged ligature rings”. So I changed these words.

Question5. It is unnecessary to repeat the results, as well as the p values in the discussion.

Answer: I agreed with this suggestion and I deleted it.

Question6. If available, data on drugs used by both groups of patients (e.g. octreotide, terlipressin, PPIs, etc.) would be interesting.

Answer: The patients in both groups received proton pump inhibitors, vasoconstrictors. Unfortunately, we did not have specific data and we will add this aspect to our follow-up study.

Question7. I think that Table 1 is unnecessary, it is already explained in the results.

Answer: I agreed with this suggestion and I deleted it.

Question8. Column "average total cost of hospitalization（No.）". “No.” is probably a typographic error and I think it should be "Yuan".

Answer:I fixed the error.

Reviewer 2：

The reviewer did not prompt any issues，thanks.

Thanks to the reviewers for the above suggestions.