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Reviewer’s report:

General

This is a well written study comprising a large number of colonoscopies. It highlights the importance of proper bowel preparation and the impact on completion rates. I have some minor suggestions that I think the authors should address.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Regarding presence of diverticulosis and impact on completion rates I think that you should mention that you have no reliable data on this in your database and therefore you have not been able to control for this variable in the logistic regression analysis.

2. Criteria used to define if the cecum was reached should be stated in the methods section.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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