

Response to Reviewers

Dear reviewer,

We gratefully thank the editor and all reviewers for their time spend making their constructive remarks and useful suggestions. Each suggested revision and comment, brought forward by the reviewers was accurately incorporated and considered. Below the comments of the reviewers are response point by point and the revisions are indicated.

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: The paper is fine as it goes, although some of the conclusions about polyp incidence are already well known. I can point out that colonoscopy is in fact used as a mass screening test in the USA, but I agree other countries may do things differently. The paper is satisfactory for publication.

Reply

We strongly agree that colonoscopy is the gold standard for screening and surveillance of colorectal polyps, but there has been growing concern about how to improve the quality of colonoscopy to minimize the occurrence of missing lesions. Taking into account the fact that we are a populous country we propose that new methods for identifying precancerous colorectal lesions can play an important role in early-stage colorectal cancer treatment and prevention.

In order to express the above more accurately, we revise "mass screening" to "primary screening" in the second paragraph of the introduction (Page 5, Line 16).

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Congratulations. It is a well-designed research work and well writing paper dealing with an interesting common issue of clinical practice.

Reply

We sincerely thank you for your careful check.

Thank you very much for your attention and time.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Xing-Xiang He

Gastroenterology

The First Affiliated Hospital of Guangdong Pharmaceutical University

19 Nonglinxia Road, Guangzhou 510080, Guangdong , China

Email: hexingxiang@gdpu.edu.cn