

Response to reviewers

Review 1: 02573214

In this manuscript the authors reported the results on a systematic review and meta-analysis on sodium picosulphate or polyethylene glycol prior to elective colonoscopy in external patients. Their results are interesting, and the meta-analysis is well established.

Dear reviewer, we would like to thank you for the time spent reviewing our manuscript and for the compliments made. Thank you very much!

Review 2: 02917331

In this paper, entitled "Sodium picosulphate or polyethylene glycol before elective colonoscopy in outpatients? A systematic review and meta-analysis", the authors reported the results on a systematic review and meta-analysis on sodium picosulphate or polyethylene glycol prior to elective colonoscopy in outpatients. This is an interesting and well-designed meta-analysis. I have only one comment for the manuscript. Comment: The authors excluded admitted patient (inpatient). Why did the authors excluded inpatient? What is the difference between inpatient and outpatient on the efficacy of bowel cleansing before colonoscopy?

Dear reviewer, we would like to thank you for the time spent reviewing our manuscript and for the comment made. Although a recent study did not observe any difference in bowel cleaning efficacy per segment between inpatient and outpatient, hospitalized patients for colonoscopy corresponded to a different population as the presence of at least one comorbidity and concomitant medication intake was higher in this group (Rotondano *et al.*, 2015). As inpatient status is an independent risk factor for inadequate bowel preparation in other studies (Hassan *et al.*, 2013; Dik *et al.*, 2015; Mahmood *et al.*, 2018) and would be a cofounding factor for the results, we decided for excluding them from our review.

Dear reviewer, we hope that we have answered all your questions and hope that your new analysis is positive. We look forward to your response, and we are available for any further questions.