

Reviewer#1

1. Major comments: Page 11. In terms of the statement “In most cases the removal of the device was done in two stages: first endoscopically for the visible beads, then laparoscopically for the remaining beads within 3 months after complete healing [48].”, a case series of Asti et al. (Ann Surg. 2017 May;265(5):941-945.) should be discussed because they reported a single-stage procedure of MSA removal undergone in several cases.

Answer: The text was modified following the request: “The removal of the device was done with a single stage procedure ^[31], or, more rarely, in two stages:”

2. Minor comments: The manuscript needs to be corrected grammatically.

Answer: The grammatical errors have been corrected.

Reviewer#2

1. I would suggest to highlight achievements at each stage of your prominent career (at the Biography section).

Answer: The career achievements (at the biography section) are highlighted in *Italic* type.

2. What is your opinion on the modulation of the efficacy of the method by the regulation (probably, on the distance) of the magnetic fields' strength (like how it's been implemented in pacemakers)?

Answer: At the present time I have not taken into consideration your idea on the regulation of the magnetic fields' strength, but I do not exclude dedicating in the future to this new path, that I had never thought of. Thank you for this.

3. Please, make sure the syntax is correct throughout the paper, with special emphasis to abbreviations and words borrowed from the other languages (actually, I would suggest deep language polishing).

Answer: English has been revised.

Reviewer # 3

1. My primary concern is the English. There are a lot of errors, both in content and context. There are too many for me to list here, but probably every paragraph contains something minor or major. In some sections the messages is lost in view of the english.

Answer: English has been revised.

2 Much of the data citing different studies are described in sentences, one after the other. Sometimes it is difficult to follow as there are so many studies described and the message is lost. It would be helpful if these were summarised in tables with all the salient points listed (e.g., type of study, number of patients, testing methods, follow up period, results etc). Even better if these could be compared to similar studies for fundoplication

Answer: I have made a table on the comparison between the results of various studies regarding MSA and fundoplication

3. One of the major criticisms of Linx is that there are no RCTs. Probably a section regarding this would be helpful

Answer: I have added this essential criticism in the conclusions of "*Fundoplication and MSA comparison*" (pag.8). and in the "*Final remarks*" (pag. 18).

4. MSA outcomes and adverse events changed when the sizing protocol was changed, there should be a description about this change of practice as there was a major reduction in adverse events thereafter (Ethicon quotes this all the time)

Answer: This remark is very sharp too and I put it in the conclusion of the subheading of *MSA removal and implant duration* that have a great variability (pag. 12) as well as in the conclusion of the heading of MSA (pag.13).

5. Pictures of the various devices being described should be included. Tables/graphs/images should be included. It is difficult to follow a paper that is just text.

Answer: I included the pictures of the devices as requested.

Re-reviewer: I am happy with these revisions

Answer: Many thanks for your useful comments.

Reviewer#4

1. There are several sentences along with the manuscript with an excess of space. Ex: ""anastomoses" between", "power magnets", "in 2003, but the article", "THE MAGNETIC SPHINCTER AUGMENTATION DEVICE".

Answer: Sorry, but I do not understand what "excess of space" means.

2. Title: I would suggest the author point out that the manuscript is a narrative review. It could give more information to readers about the article

Answer: You are right from a certain point of view, but I tried to choose a title in keeping with the aim of the Frontier Article.

3. Introduction: Author state several sentences not supported by references. After any statement, a reference should be presented.

Answer: References have been inserted after assertive statements.

4. Methods: The author did not show any information regarding methodology.

Answer: I have given some information regarding the methodology followed for collecting the studies. However, a systematic review is not the object of this study, where I tried to fulfill the aim of the Frontier Article giving a perspective on the direction of future research, starting from the present state. Thanks for your useful observations.