

## Answer to Reviewer

Thank you for your important comments, which were extremely helpful for improving the quality of our manuscript.

*1. The title is clear and concise.*

Thank you very much.

*2. The introduction has a rationale but the hypothesis should be added.*

According to your comment, the hypothesis was added to the revised manuscript. Following sentence was added into the introduction section; “We hypothesized that well-designed combination of endoscopic features might be useful for the diagnosis of SSLs.”

*3. The methodology, flowchart for the study design regarding total number of cases, selected cases, diagnostic method and any other information should be added.*

We added flowchart for the study design regarding total number of cases and selected cases (Figure 2). The information of diagnostic method was added. Following sentence was added into the method section; “All polyps detected by white light imaging during colonoscopy were washed with water, and also assessed by NBI with and without magnification.”

*4. The results, ROC curve of the predictors should be added, three independent (size, mucus cap, and indistinct borders) against one dependent (diagnosis of SSLs).*

ROC curves of the three predictors (size, mucus cap, and indistinct borders) were added (Figure 3B, 3C, and 3D).

*5. In the text, expanded crypts opening should be considered as not significant in the univariate analysis.*

The following sentence was added into the result section; “On the other hand, expanded crypts opening was not significant in the univariate analysis.” In the Core Tips section, “expanded crypts

opening” was deleted.

*6. Figure 1 should be provided with a resolution of high quality.*

We submit the Figure 1 with power point file.

*7. The discussion should be reformulated to be integrated with the other findings.*

The following sentence was added as a preface of the discussion section; “We found that size >5 mm, mucus cap, and indistinct borders were independent predictors for SSLs. The combination of these three features in serrated polyps allowed the diagnosis of SSLs with 75% sensitivity, 80% specificity, and 78.4% accuracy.”

***Science editor***

*1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the endoscopic diagnosis for colorectal sessile serrated lesions. The topic is within the scope of the WJG.*

*(1) Classification: Grade C;*

*(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: It is an interesting retrospective study trying to find an accurate diagnostic method for diagnosis of colorectal sessile serrated lesions. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and*

*(3) Format: There are 2 tables and 3 figures. A total of 28 references are cited, including 15 references published in the last 3 years. There are 10 self-citations (Ref. 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 24). The topics of some of the self-citations are not related to this study.*

*2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by Editage was provided.*

*3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search.*

*4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG.*

*5 Issues raised:*

*(1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents.*

*Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows*

*or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;*

*(2) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text; (3) Authors should always cite references that are relevant to their study. Please check and remove any references that not relevant to this study; (4) Authors should not cite their own unrelated published articles. Please check and remove any references not relevant to this study; and (5) Authors should cite no more than 3 their own published articles relevant to this study. Please check and remove the inessential self-citations. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.*

Answer for Science editor

1-4 Thank you very much for your review.

5 (1) We submit the Figures with power point file.

(2) The “Article Highlights” was described at the end of the main text.

(3) We removed several references that not relevant to this study.

(4) (5) We removed the inessential self-citations (Ref. 10, 11, 13, 15, 20, 21, 24 in previous version).

*Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.*

Thank you very much. We added Audio Core Tip, according to Editorial Office’s comment.