We thank the reviewers for their careful review and insightful comments. Please find our point-by-point response in the following. The manuscript has been revised accordingly.

***Editorial comments:*** *Changes to be made by the Author(s):  
1. Please take this opportunity to thoroughly proofread the manuscript to ensure that there are no spelling or grammar issues. The JoVE editor will not copy-edit your manuscript and any errors in the submitted revision may be present in the published version.*

We have proofread the manuscript to correct spelling and grammatical errors.

*2. Please obtain explicit copyright permission to reuse any figures from a previous publication. Explicit permission can be expressed in the form of a letter from the editor or a link to the editorial policy that allows re-prints. Please upload this information as a .doc or .docx file to your Editorial Manager account. The Figure must be cited appropriately in the Figure Legend, i.e. “This figure has been modified from [citation].”*

Explicit copyright permission information has been included in the resubmission.

*3. Figures 1 and 2: Please add figure panel labels in figure.*

Figure panel labels have been added.

*4. Please provide an email address for each author.*

Email addresses for all authors have been listed in the manuscript.

*5. Keywords: Please provide at least 6 keywords or phrases.*

Additional keywords have been included

*6. Please use SI abbreviations for all units: L, mL, µL, h, min, s, etc.*

SI units have been used

*7. Please include a space between all numbers and their corresponding units: 50 mL, 37 °C, 60 s; etc.*

Spaces have been added between numbers and units.

*8. Please revise the protocol text to avoid the use of any personal pronouns (e.g., "we", "you", "our" etc.).*

Protocol text has been revised to remove personal pronouns

*9. 2.4/2.5.7/2.5.8: Please write the text in the imperative tense. Any text that cannot be written in the imperative tense may be added as a “Note.”*

The items in question have been rewritten in the imperative tense, or added as Notes.

*10. As we are a methods journal, please revise the Discussion to explicitly cover the following in detail in 3-6 paragraphs with citations:  
a) Critical steps within the protocol  
b) Any modifications and troubleshooting of the technique  
c) Any limitations of the technique  
d) The significance with respect to existing methods  
e) Any future applications of the technique*

The Discussion section has been revised as requested

*11. References: Please do not abbreviate journal titles.*

The bibliography has been reformatted to use full journal titles   
  
***Reviewers' comments:******Reviewer #1:*** *Manuscript Summary:  
It is a well written MS and protocol for a device which is badly needed for harvesting full thickness micro-columns.*We thank the reviewer for the encouraging comment.

***Reviewer #2:*** *Manuscript Summary:  
Overall, the description of the process is pretty straightforward, as is the authors' rationale and motivation for developing this technique and device. I think it would help to have more thorough descriptions and pictures of the final harvest device because it is the final product that really matters; I am completely unfamiliar with how to set up and use the tools here, but I bet there are lots of perfectly suitable methods to make the final product. So the key to recreating their device is not necessarily setting up the tools in the exact same way but instead in producing a similar needle in the end. I also would like to hear a comment on how durable these needles are and how quickly they go dull. I do not mean robust data or expensive SEM images of needle tips after being used, but rather a statement like, "In our experience, # needles are sufficient to harvest #columns efficiently." Lastly, their final paragraph seems out of place and is completely untested conjecture (which they acknowledge). Overall and interesting video manuscript.*

The technique is actually relatively insensitive to needle dulling during the procedure – the main failure mode of this technique is the needles buckling. For swine skin we normally use 19 gauge needles, which are thick enough that they rarely buckle, and each animal experiment (typically involving about 3,000 – 5,000 microcolumns) usually requires only 2-3 needles. This discussion has been added to the Discussion section. The last paragraph has been revised to remove the speculative portion about potential utility in cosmetic resurfacing/scar revision applications.  
  
***Reviewer #3:*** *Manuscript Summary:  
This manuscript describes the fabrication of a micro-column tissue harvester.  
  
Major Concerns:  
Please add a photograph of the needle after it has been processed through step 1.2.14.*

Photographs of a finished needle have been added to Figure 2

*Minor Concerns:  
For step 1.1.6- What is the desired difference in diameter and thickness between the two wheels?*

About 9 mm different in diameters is typically sufficient, this has been added to the manuscript. There is no specific recommendation for thickness.

*For 1.2.3 a suggested length of needle is specified for pig skin. Could the authors please add a common gauge range of needles used for these studies?*

19 gauge is typically used in our lab, 25 gauge is the smallest size we have used. These characteristics have been added to the manuscript.  
  
***Reviewer #4:*** *Manuscript Summary:  
Methodology for generating harvesting needles that can be used to collect full-thickness skin tissue without causing donor site scarring.  
  
Major Concerns:  
The statement "without causing donor site scarring" is inaccurate. This methodology minimizes scarring. The authors should note this apparatus will create a wound 0.5 mm in diameter, which is less trauma than via traditional techniques; however, those prone to hypertrophic scarring and keloids can develop a scar.*

We agree with the reviewer that while skin is generally able to heal without scarring from microinjuries, there are exceptions, such as in keloid-prone individuals, where that may not be true. We have expanded the Discussion section to include discussion of such cases.

*Minor Concerns:  
Please review for spelling/grammatical errors.*

The manuscript has been reviewed to correct spelling and grammatical errors