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Reviewer's report:

Continuous improvement in the quality of colonoscopic examination, expressed in ADR, PDR, CIT and CIR, requires research that determines the factors affecting the above indicators. The endoscopist's experience, the withdrawal times and the quality of bowel preparation for colonoscopy are essential. Due to the lack of data, these important parameters were not included in the work. It is suspected that more experienced endoscopists also had higher ADR (>25) and probably they were more likely to intubate the ileum. Is all patients required intubation of the ileum during colonoscopy? Probably part of the endoscopists ended the examination after intubation of the caecum because there was no obligation to assess the ileum. Interesting is the dependence of intubation of the small intestine on the ADR level of endoscopists. The assessment of the quality of bowel cleansing for the exam is poor, because it refers to the entire colon, not to its proximal part, which is usually less well prepared.

Taking into account my doubts, I believe that the research has been well carried out and the conclusions are correct.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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