

Dear Professor Lian-Sheng Ma, Editor - in - Chief

We were really happy to take your message. The replies to the comments are shown below. Would you check them? Please let me know if there are any deficiencies.

Sincerely yours,

Masaya Uesato

---

<Answering Reviewers>

Reviewer #1:

>1. Table 1 shows that the minimum age of the patients is 63. Although this study targets elderly patients, the definition of “elderly” is not clear. It may influence on the result.

→ We really agree with you. We used “elderly” only because the subjects were 73 years old on average. In generally, people over 65 years old are “elderly”, and we thought it would be inappropriate to use it in our manuscript. So we deleted “elderly”.

>2. What do “severe comorbidities” and “high aspiration risks” indicate? Did the authors exclude respiratory disease, for example COPD, bronchial asthma and interstitial lung disease? Did the authors make a decision based on respiratory function test? The authors should show the data. In fact, most patients with gastric cancers are elderly, so their prevalence rate of respiratory disease is high. Will we apply STOP questionnaire to such patients?

→ ESD in our institution is done under sedation or general anesthesia. The “severe comorbidities” means severe heart disease and severe renal failure, and does not include respiratory disease. The patients with “severe comorbidities” and “high aspiration risks” were excluded, and done under general anesthesia. In this study, respiratory function tests were not performed in all cases.

Although some cases were examined, there was not association between respiratory function test results and intraoperative AHI in those cases. However, as you pointed out, we think it is necessary to examine the causal relationship between respiratory function test result and intraoperative AHI in detail. That is the research task from now on. And, in our cases, there were 3 patients with mild respiratory comorbidity, none of which had subjective symptoms. I added about this to the "result" section. (page 11, line 4-6, red words)

---

Science Editor:

>(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is an interesting report, but some questions remain unsolved. Although this study targets elderly patients, the definition of “elderly” is not clear. It may influence on the result. The authors need to add more details in the “method” section.

→ This study included 35 patients underwent ESD with sedation from 2014 to 2016, did not focus on elderly patients. Therefore, we deleted “elderly”.

>The highest single-source similarity index in the CrossCheck report showed to be 7%. Please rephrase these repeated sentences.

→ We confirmed the similar sentences (7%) you point out, and rephrased (red words).

>Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

→ We uploaded the final document reported to the founding agency.

>Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

→ We uploaded the original figure (1,2) document using PowerPoint.