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Reviewer's report:

This study aim to compare the efficacy of conventional colonoscopy and NBI in terms of adenoma detection rate and total number of polyp/adenoma detected. Here are my review comments:

Major
1. It is curious for me why the author report the result of RCT and meta-analysis in the same study though it is not unacceptable. Moreover, the results of meta-analysis is not very different from that by van den Broek that published in GIE previously therefore the author can explain the specific purpose of adding this part in their work or conducting this meta-analysis. (for example, newly published well-designed studies were included in this analysis, etc.. )

2. The methodology was well conducted and generally acceptable in terms of study design and statistics. The only point that the author should clarify is whether they use chromoendoscopy (ie. Indigocarmine dye-spraying) or not during the process of conventional colonoscopy observation because this may partially increase the possibility of detecting more lesions

3. Regarding the discussion, the author can further discuss some important issues in depth. For example: 1) the darkness of current NBI system may counteract its advantage for detecting neoplasms and thus new technology (or new generation NBI) is anticipated, 2) impact of colon preparation on this study and also on other reviewed studies, 3) flat or non-polyoid type neoplasm issues, 4) impact of different endoscopic system: some of the reviewed studies was conducted using Lucera whereas some with Exera endoscopic system. This may also impact on the diversity of results that observed in different studies.

4. In the discussion section, the author should also highlight what they add to the already known knowledge in this field by this study.

Minor
1. Adler was misspelled as Addler in the tables and figures. Please correct.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.