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Dear Rachel:

Thank you for this opportunity to resubmit our paper entitled, "Drain tube migration into the anastomotic site of an esophagojejunostomy for gastric small cell carcinoma: short report" We appreciate the remarks of the reviewers and have incorporated their suggestions to improve the manuscript.

Specifically, we have followed the formatting outlined in Author Guidelines. Questions raised by the reviewers have been answered by revisions to the text, and below we have provided point-by-point responses. We have also had the manuscript professionally edited by a medical editor so that the English is up to your high standard.

Again, many thanks for allowing us to resubmit our manuscript. We look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly,

Po-Chu Lee, MD, MSc
Point-by-point responses to reviewer comments

Referee 1:

1. Please focus on the intraluminal migration of a drain. Small cell carcinoma and clinical symptoms of cardia cancer are out of boundary of this paper.

   **Author Response:** We have removed data and discussion regarding small cell carcinoma and symptoms of cardiac cancer.

2. Postoperative course within one month should be described in detail. The color, amount, and odor of drainage are import factors.

   **Author Response:** There was approximately 80 ml, yellowish-white, foamy, foul smelling drainage per day postoperatively. We have included this information in the text.

3. We assume that closed drain was inserted though flank area. In that situation, how could you remove the drain under endoscopic guidance?

   **Author Response:** We removed the drain by retrieving the drain from the outside of abdominal drain wound while observing the removal endoscopically. After the drain was removed, no intraperitoneal organs (such as small bowel, liver, or spleen) were visible. The mucosal defect over the anastomotic site (viewed via the endoscope) caused by the migrated drain appeared to be well approximated after removal of the drain.

   We realize “guidance” was not an appropriate term to describe our procedure. We have clarified the manuscript with the information above, and removed the term guidance when describing the drain removal.

Referee 2:

Discretionary revisions For instance it will be useful to understand why the drain was kept in place for about a month? It will also be very useful to understand why the authors had to retrieve the drain under endoscopic guidance?

**Author Response:** We left the drain in place because the color, amount, and odor of the drainage made us suspect there was minor leakage of the esophagojejunostomy anastomotic site. Because the amount of drainage did not decrease over the course of
a month, we were concerned about the integrity of the anastomosis, and thus decided to check the esophagojejunostomy anastomotic site endoscopically.

We have clarified this in the manuscript.

Minor essential revisions
The authors should review the figures number since in the legends appear to be 1A and 1B while in the text the figures are marked as 1 and 2 respectively.
**Author Response:** Figure 1A and 1B have been deleted from the manuscript based on the comment of Reviewer 1 that small cell carcinoma is out of the scope of this report. Other figures have been renumbered accordingly.

**Editorial requests:**

1) It is our policy to request proof of the patient’s written and signed consent for the publication of their clinical details and any relevant images. Can I therefore ask you to please provide us with a copy of the consent form signed to by the patient (or their relative), either via post, fax, or email?
**Author Response:** The patient informed consent form has been included.

2) Please document informed consent in the Methods section of your manuscript.
**Author Response:** We have documented the patient’s informed consent at the conclusion of the case report section.

3) Please include a 'Competing interests' section between the Conclusions and Authors' contributions. If there are none to declare, please write 'The authors declare that they have no competing interests'.
**Author Response:** The Competing Interests statement has been included.

4) Please include an Authors' contributions section before the Acknowledgements and Reference list.
For the Authors' contributions we suggest the following kind of format (please use initials to refer to each author's contribution): AB carried out the molecular genetic
studies, participated in the sequence alignment and drafted the manuscript. JY carried out the immunoassays. MT participated in the sequence alignment. ES participated in the design of the study and performed the statistical analysis. FG conceived of the study, and participated in its design and coordination. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Author Response: The authors’ contributions section has been included in the manuscript.