

ANSWERING REVIEWERS



March 25, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: Manuscript 7816.docx).

The authors Syed Mohsin Ali and Syeda Umm-a-Omarah Gilani were English speakers from Pakistan, and we proofread our manuscript and ensured to ensure language correctness. We hope that our revised manuscript could reach A level. If the editor committee consider this manuscript need further proofreading by professional English language editing companies, please tell us and we will seek such certificate.

Title: Kudo's pit pattern Classification colorectal neoplasma: A meta-analysis .

Author: Ming Li *, Syed Mohsin Ali*, Syeda Umm-a-Omarah Gilani, Jing Liu, Yan-Qing Li, Xiu-Li Zuo
The two * indicated authors contributed evenly.

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7816

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

We updated the data and format in the revised manuscript.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

(1) A major methodological problem with the paper is the lack of publication bias and sensitivity analysis.

Thanks for your professional suggestion. In our revised manuscript, we investigated the publication bias using funnel plot, Egger's test, and Begg's test. For sensitivity analysis, we investigated the pooled sensitivity and specificity by removing one study each time. And we also investigated a subgroup consists of 11 magnifying chromoendoscopy studies.

(2) The authors should provide the data about the amount of cases for every type of Kudo's classification and the final pathological diagnostic results of every study. Because these data are important to reveal the accuracy and specificity of Kudo's classification.

Thanks for your kind suggestion. In our revised manuscript, there were four studies provided the numbers of every type of Kudo's classification, and we pooled them in Table 2.

(3) Abstract, line 2: changed "it" to "and"

Sorry for grammatical mistake. We redressed this and similar mistakes in the revised manuscript.

(4) Abstract, line 5: "usetto"?

Sorry for grammatical mistake. We redressed this sentence as "The aim of this study was to find out the sensitivity and specificity of Kudo pit pattern classification for the detection of neoplastic polyps."

(5) Abstract, methods, line 3,4, grammar error

Sorry for grammatical mistake. We redressed this sentence as "Kudo et al developed a pit pattern based criteria, known as Kudo's Classification, to evaluate colonic mucosa using magnifying colonoscopy."

(6) Abstract, methods, line 5,6: delete "individually" and "respectively"

Thanks for the kind suggestion. We deleted the two word.

(7) Abstract, results: provide the basic data about case number, etc.

Thanks for your kind suggestion. In our revised manuscript, 5450 colorectal lesions from 3452 patients were identified.

(8) Abstract, conclusion: delete the last sentence.

Sure, we deleted it.

(9) Methods, Data sources, line 4: in the "search terms", why have not colorectal polyp and Kudo's classification?

Thanks for your professional suggestion. We added this two search terms and the publication searching process was updated in the revised manuscript.

(10) Methods, Data sources, line 6: "August 2012" ? the new references should be needed.

Thanks for your suggestion. The search was updated until the end of March 2014, and a total of 20 studies was included in our revised manuscript.

(11) Statistical analysis, line 8 delete "SROC"

Thanks for your suggestion, we deleted it.

(12) Table.1 ,No. of polyps: the number of every type of Kudo's classification should be provided and their pathological diagnosis.

Thanks for your suggestion. In our updated manuscript, there are 6 studies provided numbers of each pit pattern, and 4 of them provided the number of four each pit pattern by pathological diagnose. We pooled this four table and formed table 2 in the revised manuscript.

(13) Table.1 , line 2,3: Taiwan is not a country, I suggest changing it to "China"

Sure, we cannot agree with you more. We used China instead of Taiwan in our revised manuscript.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Sure, they were corrected in the revised manuscript.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,



Xiu-Li Zuo, MD, PhD

Department of Gastroenterology,

Qilu Hospital, Shandong University,

Jinan 250012, P.R. China

E-mail: xiulizuo@gmail.com