Author’s response to reviews

Title: Ileal intubation is not associated with higher detection rate of right-sided conventional adenomas and serrated polyps compared to cecal intubation after adjustment for overall adenoma detection rate

Authors:

Martin Buerger (martin.buerger@uk-koeln.de)
Philipp Kasper (philipp.kasper@uk-koeln.de)
Gabriel Allo (gabriel.allo@uk-koeln.de)
Johannes Gillessen (johannes.gillessen@uk-koeln.de)
Christoph Schramm (christoph.schramm@uk-koeln.de)

Version: 2 Date: 22 Oct 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:

Thank you for submitting your revision. Before we are able to proceed, I would ask that you revisit two points from the previous review, which I think you could more fully address. I have outlined these below.

Point/response to reviewer 1:

Response 1: Endoscopists’ experience was reported in the method section (page 6, line 7-8). Since all endoscopists included in our study were classified as experienced outcomes were not adjusted for endoscopists’ experience. Therefore, we did not assume that more experienced endoscopists would also have higher detection rates and higher ileal intubation rates.

I acknowledge that you have put in the information you outlined, however, I think that you could more explicitly state that you made the assumption that the experience level was similar amongst the endoscopists included, and that you therefore didn't adjust for this factor.

Response (method section, page 6, line 11-12): We explicitly stated that we did not adjust for experience of participating endoscopists because we assumed a similar level of experience among them.

Point/response to reviewer 2:
point 1 from ref2: 1) Some more detail on the retrospective identification of cases included is warranted in order to understand the validity of these. Was this a prospective case database? Clinical or administrative? etc

I'm sorry, I don't think that you've adequately addressed this point. I believe the reviewer was fairly clear in their request for details about the source of your data. You might consider how to clarify this beyond the language you have used, for example, was it multiple databases? Was it a single database? Does it encompass all cases? Only those from a single centre, a number of centres? If only a few or a single, how representative is this, and what kind of percentage of all procedures are they thought to represent? I believe this information gives the reader an idea of the representativeness of the data presented, and whether one might suspect that there might be bias in the data analysed.

Response (method section, page 6, line 1-3): We added the requested information to the beginning of the method section and hope now to clearly explain the source of data used for our analysis.