

Reviewer 1:

“This paper is a comprehensive review of the need for post-polypectomy surveillance colonoscopy following removal of colonic polyps. It studies the need for surveillance colonoscopy related to the risk of developing cancer and the frequency and total period of time over which such surveillance should be continued. The review is very comprehensive, but after reading it one is still left somewhat bewildered as to what policy should be adopted. Instead of a Summary it needs a Conclusion with recommendations and guidance as to the selection of patients for surveillance, and the frequency and the total duration of the surveillance. A Table similar to the Table in the Appendix giving the guidelines from the American Gastroenterological Association would be helpful. A minor matter is that the title in full should be given at the first mention of the abbreviations CIMP and HGD”

Response:

- **Abbreviations CIMP and HGD are now explained at their first use in the text.**
- **A conclusion table summarising current consensus has been created. In addition, areas requiring further study are highlighted. Without significant new published evidence in the years since the current clinical guidelines were written, there is not yet sufficient basis on which to recommend that the guidelines be altered. However, there are specific areas of uncertainty which this review identifies as requiring further study.**

Reviewer 2:

“I enjoyed reading this mini-review of post-polypectomy surveillance colonoscopy with reference to various international guidelines (US, UK, and European). The review also covers the limitations, compliance, adherence with guidelines and when to stop surveillance. The review is well-written, brief and is very much within the scope of the journal. The only comment I have is that reference citations should adhere to the Vancouver style and the Journal’s ‘instruction to authors’ regarding the reference citations.”

Response:

- **Vancouver referencing style has now been used.**