

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We have revised the manuscript as suggested and would like to re-submit it for your consideration.

We have addressed the editor's and reviewers' comments, and the amendments are highlighted. Point-to-point responses to the comments are listed below. We hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in your esteemed journal. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have further questions.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

- 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? - yes
- 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?
- yes
- 3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? - yes
- 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? - yes
- 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? - yes
- 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? - yes
- 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? - yes
- 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? - yes
- 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? - yes
- 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? - yes
- 11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? - yes
- 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely

and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? - yes

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors have prepared their manuscript after STROBE Statement - yes

14 Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? - yes

Dear Authors, Congratulation for your article! The idea is very original consisting in the introduction of both magnets proximal and distal from the same side - distal using the colonoscope and then the Guide wire under xray supervision. It was demonstrated that the magnets are assembling themselves in the desired annular position and self assemble. In Only one experiment the magnets failed to arrange in the desired position but it was finally recovered. At 6 days median the magnets are expelled. This is an excellent experimental demonstration in pigs. For human application it will need a very short and membrane like stenosis, this is unfortunately rare, most of stenosis have a short fibrotic tract, so, it will have to prove its success in human studies. For the time being the paper is excellent from all points of view.

Answer: Thank you for reviewing the manuscript. I am very glad that all the reviews I receive are positive. According to your comments, no changes have been made to the manuscript, except that another reviewer requested changes to the language expression.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear Editor, Dear Author, I read with great interest the manuscript entitled "Novel deformable self-assembled magnetic anastomosis ring (DSAMAR) for endoscopic treatment of colonic stenosis via natural orifice" by Zhang MM et al. This was an animal study evaluating efficacy and safety of magnetic anastomosis for the treatment of benign colonic stenosis via natural orifice, by the use of a previously unreported deformable self-assembled magnetic anastomosis ring (DSAMAR). I consider the study well conducted, well presented, and relevant for the research context.

Answer: I am very glad to receive your review comments. In the revised draft, we polished the language. We hope the manuscript will be published as soon as possible. Thank you again.