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Dear Sir,

Thanks for the opportunity to continue in the peer review process. We appreciate the commentaries of the reviewers that have been very helpful to improve the manuscript. We have included the comments in the revised manuscript and are providing a point-by-point response to the concerns.

Best regards

Ludovic Reveiz MD.

Reviewer's report:

**Reviewer**: Mainor R Antillon

- Page 10 paragraph 3 the author report overall polyp detection of 36.1 % but in page 12, last sentence reports 37%. Which one is it?

Author's response: The overall polyp detection rate per patient *by visual inspection* in the entire study group was 37.1%. However the overall polyp detection rate by histological examination per patient in the entire study group was lower. We include now in the discussion section the data from the overall polyp detection rate by histological examination per patient.

- Page 10, paragraph 3 needs to be revised and the numbers/percentages need to match. 53.1 %, 36.8% and 6.89 % do not make 100%.

Author's response: we reword the paragraph to separate “lesions” from “polyps” and described the proportions based on the number of polyps. We think that this clarifies the presentation of data.

- What were the withdrawal times in page 13. There is plenty of evidence that withdrawal times as a surrogate correlated to adenoma detection rates.
Author’s response: We agree that there is evidence that withdrawal times has influence on the proportion of detected polyps. This was discussed in the discussion section and the information is available. Data, excluding polypectomy duration was included into the study.

Reviewer: Han-Mo Mo Chiu

- Here are the remaining minor essential revisions required:
  1. In ABSTRACT page, result section: the lower confidence limit of 95% CI of mean number of polyps and mean number of adenoma were not expressed completely. Please add.

Author’s response: we add this data in the abstract.

- Regarding different endoscopic system applied in previous study, the author can describe more specifically: LUCRA vs. EXCERA. The author can refer to Uraoka et al. Impact of narrow-band imaging in screening colonoscopy Digestive Endoscopy 2010 Jul;22 Suppl 1:S54-6. in which this issue has been well described and reviewed.

Author’s response: thanks for notice this relevant reference. We performed a subgroup analysis according to the setting systems (LUCERA vs. EXERA II) and included those findings in the result section and the discussion section. We also incorporated the reference.