

Response to reviewers and science editor

Thank you very much for your useful comment. We revised our manuscript based on your comment and revised parts are shown by red characteristics. Please see the revised manuscript to consider for the acceptance.

To reviewer #1:

My only advice is that the author should review and discuss similar cases in more detail.

----- Thank you very much. We reviewed similar cases and added more information in table 2.

To reviewer #2:

1. please verify all data in the text, such as "blood pressure of 55/14 mmHg".

----- We added values of abnormal measured data into the "laboratory examinations" section in the text.

2. "Nothing abnormal was detected upon physical examination, including her skin." Is the sentence accurate? The patient has developed blood pressure and heart rate problems.

----- We made a mistake and revised the manuscript. We are very sorry about that.

3. how long after that did the patient's hemodynamics become stable? The treatment method should be further described in detail, such as what hemostatic drugs are used? How to carry out anti shock treatment?

----- We added the information in the section of "Further diagnostic work-up" and "Treatment".

4. please provide pictures of scars at the esophageal ulcer on the 60th day after operation.

----- We provided pictures as Figure 4A and 4B.

5. why only use PubMed search? Do you need to use other databases?

----- We searched by J-STAGE and Google Scholar, and we didn't find other cases. We added that in discussion section.

6. as a literature review, table 2 should also list the basic information and treatment of patients, such as age, sex, complications, imaging findings, prognosis time, etc.

----- We added basic information and treatment of patients. On the other hand, we couldn't get original article of reference number 5 and 16, and we showed as "Unknown" about some information in table 2.

7. "where we found 17 cases from January 1, 2014, through March 31, 2022 (Table 2)[2,5,7,9-17]". Whether the references cited here are correct, for example, 12. The object described here is diabetic rat. Please verify other references cited.

----- Thank you very much. As you mentioned, citation number 12 is incorrect. We are very sorry about that. We deleted it in the reference and sorted the reference number.