

Responses to the Reviewers' Comments

Dear Editor,

Re: Establishing a model to measure and predict quality of gastrointestinal endoscopy
(ID: 43359)

Thank you very much for the decision and advice. We have carefully studied the reviewers' comments and the main comments focused on language polishing. We revised the manuscript with the aid of professional language editing company. Moreover, we made revision according to the editor's comments. All changes have been marked in red in the revised manuscript.

We hope that this resubmitted version is acceptable for publication in your journal.
Looking forward to hearing from you,

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

Zhao-Shen Li, MD, Professor

Digestive Endoscopy Center, Department of Gastroenterology, Changhai Hospital,

Naval Medical University

168 Changhai Road, Shanghai, 200433, China

lizhaoshenmd@163.com

Tel: +86-21-31161347 Fax: +86-21-55621735

Reviewer comments:

Reviewer #1:

Very interesting study about a model to measure and predict quality of gastrointestinal endoscopy in mainland China. The manuscript is very well written. The questionnaires in the survey are excellent. The results are important and will give the endoscopist a guideline for the clinical practice.

[Response: Thanks very much for your comments and we have made minor correction accordingly.](#)

Reviewer #2:

This study is an interesting study. In this study, the authors established a model to measure and predict quality of gastrointestinal endoscopy. Data including endoscopy experience, equipment, facility, qualification of endoscopists, and other relevant metrics were collected and analyzed. The authors found that the length of experience in endoscopy, weekly working hours, weekly night shifts, annual vacation days and job satisfaction were predictors for occurrence of medical malpractice and patient's disturbance, but the length of experience in endoscopy and ratio of endoscopists vs nurses were not adequate to establish an effective predictive model for complications of endoscopy. Overall, the study is well designed and the results are interesting. 1 the title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. 2 the abstract summarizes and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3 the methods are described in detail. 4 the research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. 5 the discussion is well display. Recent references are included. 6 the manuscript is well written. Some minor language revision is required.

[Response: We appreciate your comment. We revised the manuscript with the aid of professional language editing company.](#)

Reviewer #3:

Very interesting study. I have no specific comments. Only some minor language

polishing should be revised.

Response: We appreciate your comment. We made language polishing with the aid of professional language editing company.