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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors report the comparison of the peroral endoscopic myotomy between longer and shorter. The evaluation is beneficial to all clinicians, endoscopists and patients. The report has a very important aspect and is interesting, however, there are the following concerns:  

**Major comments**  
The authors compare the longer myotomy with shorter myotomy. However, the incision length is determined by identifying the responsible site causing the symptoms. Moreover, patients diagnosed with Chicago classification type III esophageal achalasia, diffuse esophageal spasm, and Jackhammer esophagus require a longer muscular incision than usual. Therefore, the significance the comparison the incision length is questionable. In addition, the result that the shorter procedure requires reduced operation time lacks novelty.

**Minor comments**  
#1 The definition of Long Myotomy and Short Myotomy is unclear.  
#2 Figure 2: the legend needs to be detailed for the unfamiliar readers.  
#3 A figure showing the significant difference in operation time is required.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The article is within the scope of the journal. The subject is interesting. The presentation is well written and organized. Likewise, it is easy to read. On the other hand, the results presented are important in the area of article knowledge, and represent an advance. However, some improvements are needed: a) In the first place, the introduction should be extended and the state of the question should be deepened. b) The conclusions section should be extended and explain the scientific contribution of the work presented. Likewise, a set of future lines of work should be included.
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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Manuscript relevant to the scientific community. The meta-analysis compared the clinical effectiveness of longer and shorter myotomy. Proper language with little need for polishing.