**Supplemental Table 1. Comparison of treatment outcomes between H-ESD and C-ESD groups before propensity score matching**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | H-ESD  n = 29 | C-ESD  n = 186 | *P* value |
| Procedure time, min |  |  |  |
| Median (IQR) | 20.0 (12-27) | 43.5 (30-62) | <0.001 |
| En bloc resection, n (%) | 29 (100%) | 186 (100%) | - |
| Complete resection, n (%) | 29 (100%) | 179 (96.2%) | 0.60 |
| Curative resection, n (%) | 28 (96.6%) | 163 (87.6%) | 0.21 |
| Perforation, n (%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (4.8%) | 0.61 |
| Delayed bleeding, n (%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (5.9%) | 0.37 |

*P* values were calculated using the Fisher’s exact test for categorical data and the Mann-Whitney U test for continuous data.

H-ESD, hybrid endoscopic submucosal dissection; C-ESD, conventional endoscopic submucosal dissection; IQR, interquartile range.