

June 1, 2014

Dear Editor,

Thank you for considering our paper for publication in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*. Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 10181-review.doc), copyright assignment, and language certificate.

Title: Magnifying narrow-band imaging with acetic acid to diagnose early colorectal cancer

Author: Norihiro Goto, Toshihiro Kusaka, Yumi Tomita, Hideyuki Tanaka, Yoshio Itokawa, Yorimitsu Koshikawa, Daisuke Yamaguchi, Yoshitaka Nakai, Shigehiko Fujii, Hiroyuki Kokuryu

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10181

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

1 Format has been updated. References and typesetting were corrected. Comments were added to the manuscript.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewers:

(1) We have added the AUCs of the three modalities in phase 2 study. However, the sample size in phase 2 study was designed for the comparison of the proportions of high-confidence predictions, and there were not significant differences of the AUCs among the three modalities. We have also added that statement in limitation of this study. The revised sentences are as follows:

“We also plotted ROC curves for each modality. The AUCs were 0.79 in M-NBI, 0.82 in MA-NBI, and 0.85 in M-CV. There were no significant differences among the three modalities.”

“Because of the small sample size in phase 2, we could not show a significant increase in the overall accuracy **or in the AUCs.**”

(2) In the legend of Figure 2, the number of colonoscopists was added. The revised sentence is as follows:

“Comparison of the areas under the receiver operating characteristic curves **of 10 colonoscopists** for differentiating early colorectal adenocarcinomas from adenomas.”

(3) To show that MA-NBI was more time-saving than M-CV, we have rewritten the method of MA-NBI and M-CV in detail. In addition, we have also added the time required for MA-NBI from the literature in discussion. The revised sentences are as follows:

“For MA-NBI, we sprayed 5 ml of a 1.5% acetic acid solution on the lesion and immediately examined the lesion. For M-CV, we sprayed a 0.2% crystal violet solution on the lesion, waited more than one minute, washed off the superfluous solution with water, and examined the lesion.”

“Moreover, MA-NBI is more time- and cost-effective than M-CV; the time required to obtain a clear image is approximately 14 seconds in MA-NBI⁵⁾, whereas more than one minute is required in M-CV.”

(4) In acknowledgment, we have added names of two colonoscopists who participated in phase 1 study as evaluators. The revised sentence is as follows: “The authors thank Dr. Tanaka and Dr. Usui for their cooperation with the study.”

(5) As the reviewer pointed out, we wrote that “ $P < 0.05$ for the comparison of M-NBI vs. MA-NBI, $P < 0.001$ for the comparison of M-NBI vs. M-CV, and not significant for the comparison of M-NBI vs. M-CV” in the explanation of Figure 2. However, the last comparison was actually “MA-NBI vs. M-CV”. We are really sorry for the confusing mistake. We have rewritten that “ $P < 0.05$ for M-NBI vs. MA-NBI, $P < 0.001$ for M-NBI vs. M-CV, and not significant for MA-NBI vs. M-CV.” We made the same mistake in the explanation of Figure 3. We have rewritten that “ $P < 0.005$ for M-NBI vs. MA-NBI, $P < 0.0005$ for M-NBI vs. M-CV, and $P = 1.0$ for MA-NBI vs. M-CV.”

3. We made use of a copyediting service and corrected syntax, prepositions and diction. We have attached the editorial certificate by American Journal Expert.

Thank you again for considering our paper for publication in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,



Norihiro Goto, MD