

24/04/2020

Dear Editorial Team,

Thank you for sending the peer review report for our manuscript (Manuscript ID 54435).

Reviewer #1: Well written manuscript. But there is no image in the manuscript. Images would have enhanced the impact of manuscript. Should have mentioned the role of these technologies in colorectal cancer screening.

Response:

We would like to thank Reviewer 1 for their time and comments. Images have been added to the manuscript, as suggested.

The role of the optical imaging technologies in adenoma detection is reviewed in detail, and the introduction section presents the evidence that adenoma detection is an appropriate surrogate marker for colorectal cancer. We have also added a sentence in the summary of the optical imaging technologies section that states that these technologies have not been shown to improve detection of advanced neoplasia, only of earlier stage adenomas.

Reviewer #2: In the present paper two completely different sections can be recognized: the first one represents a systematic overview on the several optical imaging technologies introduced to enhance topographic contrast and to facilitate the detection of adenomas; the second one is the description of the photometric stereo technology and its potential use in colonoscopy. Theoretically, the first part would introduce the second one which is likely to be most important one in the paper. Actually, the two parts appear to be completely different and is difficult to understand the connections between them. The description of the photometric stereo technology is very interesting and clear. The technology is new for endoscopists and because of this the paper could be of extreme interest for the readers. I feel, however, that the paper is lacking of figures and schemes and because of this it is likely to be quite difficult for the readers to understand exactly the possible use of the technology in endoscopy. I would suggest the authors to provide a couple of images regarding the in vitro and animal studies to show how the colon surface and polyps would appear. Moreover, some schemes showing how the technology works and how the images are created would be welcome. I would suggest the authors also to remove the first part of the study, the part managing the conventional imaging technology, and to widen the part regarding the photometric stereo technology.

Response:

We would like to thank Reviewer 2 for their time and comments. Images have been added to the manuscript, as suggested.

Reviewer 2 suggests making the link between the two sections of the manuscript clearer, and, failing this, later suggests that the first section could be deleted altogether. In the first instance, we have added a summary paragraph at the end of the first section of the paper that makes the link between the two sections much clearer. Please let us know if this sufficient, or if the second suggestion (of shortening or removing the section reviewing established optical imaging technologies) is preferred by the editorial board.

We hope you find these changes satisfactory. Please get in touch if anything else is required.

Best wishes,

Ben Shandro, on behalf of the authors