

Thank you very much for reviewing our study and giving us the opportunity to revise and resubmit this manuscript. We appreciate the time and detail provided by the reviewers. We have incorporated changes into the manuscript to the best of our ability. The manuscript has certainly benefited from these insightful revision suggestions.

Reviewer: The manuscript poses an originality in the point that POEM is feasible for a pregnant subject. There was however a possible argument from the readers that POEM could have been performed as an elective procedure. The patient could have been supported by enteral nutrition (e.g. via a nasojejunal feeding tube) until the patient completes pregnancy. This threatens a generalizability and a limitation of this report. The authors should discuss this point and explain their rationale why they decided to perform POEM in stead of other alternative approaches. Other critiques are that the authors summarize the medical history to the concise relevant history.

Answer: Concerning nasojejunal feeding tube, the patient was in the beginning of second trimester of pregnancy. Thus we decided that enteral nutrition is impractical for that long period because it can cause erosions and ulcers in stomach and esophagus. In addition to, long-term usage of nasojejunal feeding tube can also be a source of psychological stress to the patient.