Detailed Responses to Reviewer

Response to reviewer #1:

1. The patient has undergone a radical resection of esophageal cancer as the authors described. Please clarify the actual location of esophageal cancer, operation method and the surgical resection extent.

Answer: We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work. The patient had distal esophageal carcinoma, and the esophageal tumor located in 32 cm from the upper incisors with no lymph node metastasis. Excision of inferior segmental esophagus and cardia of stomach and high intrathoracic anastomosis using gastric tube were performed in the patient.

2. Since the first stent is placed for fistula, why it was not removed months later when the fistula was presumed to get healed? Which location was the benign stricture after the first stent and when were the 2nd and 3rd stents placed?

Answer: Due to lack of medical knowledge, the patient had poor compliance with doctors' order and was not timely to go to the hospital for removing stent. The benign stricture was located the upper of stent after the first stent placement. The benign stricture moved upward to the upper of the 2nd/3rd stents after them placement.

3. Line 9 of case report: what is barium "metal"examination? Typo?

Answer: We apologize for the typo in the manuscript. The "barium metal examination" has been "barium meal examination".

4. Figure legend for figure 3c and 3d were a little conflusing. Figure 3c looks like a widen stricture with stent in situ and 3d showed a removed stent.

Answer: We agree with the comment and re-wrote the sentence in the revised manuscript as the following: (b) A fully covered SEMS was placed and left in place for 4 weeks. (c) The stricture was significantly wider after the removal of (d) the fully covered SEMS.

Response to reviewer #2:

1. The authors could mention where the location of the esophageal cancer was and how long the resected part of the esophagus was. How was the anastomosis performed?

Answer: We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work. According to the reviewer's comment, we provided more details to describe the case description as the following: The esophageal tumor located in 32 cm from the upper incisors, and there was no lymph node metastasis. Excision of inferior segmental esophagus and cardia of stomach and high intrathoracic anastomosis using gastric tube were performed in the patient.

2. When were the second and third partially covered SEMSs placed? In the "Discussion" paragraph it is mentioned that "three SEMSs remained in place for over a year". But this should be mentioned also in the CASE REPORT. Where was this benign esophageal stricture located, since in the "Discussion" paragraph the authors mention that "with the successive placement of the stents, the esophageal stricture moved upward". We only know that the actual stricture described in the paper was situated 25 cm from the upper incisors.

Answer: We deeply appreciate the reviewer's suggestion. In order to more clearly introduce the time point about three stents placement, we made Fig 4, the timeline of stents placement. The benign stricture was located the upper of stent after the first stent placement. And the benign stricture moved upward to the upper of the 2nd/3rd stents after them placement.

3. What does "barium metal examination" mean? It was mentioned both in the CASE REPORT and the Figure 1 legend.

Answer: We apologize for the typo in the manuscript. The "barium metal examination" has been "barium meal examination".

4. In the text, Fig 2a corresponds to the "embedded stent", which I cannot see. In the Figure legend, Fig 2a corresponds to the stricture.

Answer: In the text, we mentioned Fig 2a with the error description. Actually, Fig 2a shows an esophageal stricture beginning 25 cm from the incisor teeth. We apologize for the problems in the original manuscript. And we have changed the mistake in the revised manuscript.

5. Fig 3c shows the wider stricture, but in the figure legend is mentioned 3d. Fig 3d shows the removed stent.

Answer: We agree with the comment and re-wrote the figure legend of Fig 3 in the revised manuscript as the following: (b) A fully covered SEMS was placed and left in place for 4 weeks. (c) The stricture was significantly wider after the removal of (d) the fully covered SEMS.