

Thank you for your kindly comments.

INTRO: Quote global data in addition to local data on CRC prevalence to make this more relevant to a global audience.

⇒ We added the global data.

“diminutive polyps have been removed commonly by cold biopsy forceps [10-12]. Recent studies reported that the complete resection rate of cold forceps polypectomy for diminutive polyps was 90-92% [13, 14].” Comment should be made about the fact that this is inferior compared to cold snare polypectomy and that this could make the estimation of polyp size less relevant.

⇒ We corrected the sentences.

⇒ Some recent studies found that the complete resection rate of cold forceps polypectomy for diminutive polyps was 90-92%^[21,22]. However, Lee et al. reported that snare polypectomy is superior to cold forceps polypectomy for the endoscopic removal of diminutive polyps with regard to completeness of polypectomy (93.2% vs 75.9%; $p = 0.009$)^[23], and Kim et al. reported that the complete resection rates for polyps sized 5 to 7mm was significantly higher in the cold snare polypectomy group compared with the cold forceps polypectomy group (93.8% vs 70.3%; $p = 0.013$)^[22]...

METHODS In estimation of polyp size without forceps or catheter, the researcher watching the clip without operating the colonoscope would have no idea how far from the mucosa they are. Please describe how this was addressed in the methods, or if it

was not addressed, please indicate this and list it as a limitation in the discussion.

⇒ We added the sentence as a limitation in the discussion.

⇒ Second, the distance between the colonoscope tip and the polyp in the video clips included 40 scenes visualizing the polyp without open biopsy forceps was variable, and it could cause the confusion of participants to estimate the size of polyp. However, we tried to record the scenes showing various distance from the colonoscope tip to the polyp in each video clip.

“An ICC below 0.59 was defined as poor agreement, an ICC of 0.60-0.79 was defined as moderate agreement, and an ICC greater than 0.80 was considered to be an excellent agreement.” Reference please.

⇒ Reference was added.

What was the hypothesis – please state this clearly. What was the primary end point – please state this clearly. Were adjustments in significance levels made for multiple analyses/endpoints? – If not, why not?

⇒ The hypothesis of our study was that the forceps estimation technique is more acute and practical than visual estimation in the measurement of colon polyp size. (wrote at bottom of the introduction)

⇒ The primary end point of our study was that the assessment of inter-observer differences and error ranges in the measurement of the polyp size. (wrote also at bottom of the introduction)

- ⇒ Unfortunately, we did not analyze the results with the adjustments in significance levels for multiple analyses. However, we think the each results without adjustments are also significant.

RESULTS Was there a learning aspect – ie are the results more accurate as the observers progressed through the 40 cases – this is likely and should be addressed in the results and analysed as such. Where is the analysis comparing accuracy of beginners and experienced endoscopists? I can see the results for each, but not a specific test used to compare the pair?

- ⇒ We think that 40 cases are not much cases. These number of 40 cases maybe not affected a learning aspect.

- ⇒ We added the following sentence in the method (3. Statistical analysis)

The significance of difference between two groups (visual estimation vs. forceps estimation) was analyzed by Wilcoxon-signed rank test.

The analysis by histologic type might also be interesting, has this been done – it looks like you have the data.

- ⇒ We analyzed the interobserver difference by histologic type. But unfortunately, there was no significant data. So, we did not include this data.

DISCUSSION “If a polyp which is needed to be removed by endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) is encountered, measuring the polyp size by forceps estimation

before removing the polyp by EMR is maybe tedious and more time consuming than visual estimation alone.” The grammar of this sentence requires work.

⇒ We corrected the sentence.

*** All corrected sentences were indicated by blue color texts in manuscript.