

Editor-in-Chief

World Journal of Gastroenterology

We thank for references for careful reading of our manuscript and for giving useful comments. In response to the referee's comments, we have revised the manuscript 32228. As you can see, we agreed with the reviewer's comments and modified the original manuscript accordingly. We showed the revised points with underlines in the revised manuscript. We look forward to the publication of our manuscript in World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Sincerely yours,

Soichiro Ako, MD

Department of Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology

Okayama University Graduate School of Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmaceutical Sciences

2-5-1 Shikata-cho, Kita-ku, Okayama City, Okayama, 700-8558 Japan

Tel: +81-86-235-7219, E-mail: soichiro.ako@gmail.com

Answers to comments of Reviewer #1

The reviewer suggested to show the patients' characteristics involved in the survival curves. According to the suggestion, we added new Table 4 and with a sentence in page 11 line 29 in order to explain the difference of patients' characteristics between patients with and without G12V mutation in serum or plasma. The added sentence is "All patients with the G12V mutation in serum or plasma were Stage III/IV, which was the only difference of the characteristics of the patients between the groups".

Major points

1. Authors should better discuss harms associated with the use of NaP preparations with proper references.

Answer) As the reviewer pointed out, the risk of NaP should be mentioned. I added the explanation about renal failure induced by NaP in page 17 line 5-8.

2. Lesion detection rates with the different preparations was not assessed here. It could be worth to state this among limitations.

Answer) As the reviewer pointed out, it become more beneficial for routine care to compare the lesion detection rates between laxatives. However, patients in this study were relatively young. So we thought that the number of patients who had lesions was not large enough to compare the lesion detection rate. We added the context in page 17 line 16- page 18 line 1.

Minor points

- 1) Abstract, methods: delete "Total"

I deleted "Total".

- 2) Abstract, methods: state the randomization ratio

I added it in page 3 line 7.

- 3) Pag.3, line 4: "...that adults of ≥ 50 years of age undergo colonoscopy.."

I changed as reviewer 1 indicated in page 5 line 4.

- 4) Pag.3 line 9: "In Japan, the intake of 2L of PEG is usually recommended for preparation. However, this amount is sometimes insufficient and a greater volume is required for some patients..."

I added references as reviewer 1 indicated as reference 2 and 3

5) Pag.4: “of between 20 and 64 years of age...” should be rephrased

I changed this phrase to “were from 20 to 64 years old” in page 7 line 9.

6) Pag.8 line 3: “A total of 200 patients were allocated to either group” should be rephrased.

I changed this sentence to “A total of 200 patients were invited to this study” in page 11 line 3.

7) Pag.8, line 12: “In both groups, all of the patients could finish the required amount of solution” should be rephrased

I rephrased to “able to take the required amount of solution.” In page 11 line 10.

8) Pag.9, line 3: “segment” may be more appropriate than “region” or “sites”.

I changed to “segment” throughout the manuscript.

9) Pag.9, line 5: Please mention the subgroup analysis in the methods section of the manuscript.

I added the context of the subgroup analysis in methods.

10) Please state which test was used to calculate p values.

I added the name of test in tables or figures.

Answers to comments of Reviewer #2

Thank you for your favorable comments. We totally agreed with the comment and we had described the renal effect in discussion in page 17 line 5-8.