

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for reviewing our work and considering it for publication in your highly-esteemed Journal. We are also thankful to all referees for their valuable contribution. Below you can find our replies to referees' comments. All changes are highlighted in the revised manuscript. Additionally, we have implemented Editor's suggestions in the edited manuscript file.

Reviewer No. 739893

Comment: *Excellent article*

Reply: Thank you very much for your kind comment.

Reviewer No. 2667551

Major comment 1: *The objective of this study was to compare full dose with split dose. Thereby, the researchers have undergone a tacit assumption in conducting their retrospective, clinical study, that the split dose is superior to full dose, even before the study results were available. It is out this tacit assumption that the researchers calculated the miss rate; the spilt dose served as the reference. Ideally to compare two methodologies against each other, a third gold-standard would be required as a common reference for both. This requires clear explaining in Methods, as well as stating in Discussion as a limitation. The subject per se demands also to be discussed, i.e., a cursory sentence towards this end as a limitation in Discussion would fall short of discussing it. Discussion would require introducing these points and rephrasing Discussion, and toning down the Conclusion.*

Reply: Thank you very much for your important comment. Accordingly, we made the appropriate clarifications as highlighted both in the Methods section (included in statistical analysis) and in Discussion (also as a limitation of our study).

Major comment 2: *Did the two reported endoscopists, who did all the examinations, conduct the examination once for both full dose and split dose or was it that one endoscopist conducted uniquely only full dose, and the other split dose? This should be clear in text. A limitation of interobserver variability has been mentioned, but it remains unclear how this difference came about. Conclusion would require further toning down.*

Reply: As added in the Methods section (colonoscopy procedures) one endoscopist conducted the diagnostic examinations using uniquely previous-day preparation and the other performed the second series with split-dose preparation. Moreover, we explained in the Discussion that lack of assessment of possible interobserver variability regarding preparation status assessment weakens our results.

Minor comment 1: *Colonoscopic procedures, 1 paragraph: Please delete the names of the endoscopists. Rephrasing the first sentence with something equable to "Two equally experienced endoscopists with experience of more than 5000 colonoscopies did all the examinations" suffice to convey the methodological aspects of the study.*

Reply: We have corrected it accordingly

Minor comment 2: *Colonoscopic procedures, 1 paragraph, 3 sentence: Replace "he" with "the endoscopist".*

Reply: We have corrected it accordingly

Minor comment 3: *Colonoscopic procedures, last paragraph: The standard abbreviations are a.m. and p.m.*

Reply: We have corrected it accordingly

Minor comment 4: *Statistical analysis: Remove the colon (:) in the first sentence. Replace big caps for “Beta” with small “beta”.*

Reply: We have done the suggested changes

Minor comment 5: *Results: provide the 95% confidence intervals (C. I.) and p-values for all reported parameters.*

Reply: The unstandardized B is the OR in the multivariate analysis; therefore we made the respective changes. No OR could be calculated in the univariate analysis due to the lack of gold standard

Athanasios D. Sioulas,

Corresponding author

Hepatogastroenterology Unit, Second Department of Internal Medicine and Research Institute, Attikon University General Hospital, Rimini 1, 12462 Haidari, Greece. E-mail: athsioulas@yahoo.gr, tel: +306974840723, fax: +302105326422