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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This manuscript is an original article that retrospectively investigated the endoscopic features in identifying the colorectal serrated sessile lesions with dysplasia, by compared with SSLs without dysplasia. This study showed that reddish color, a microvascular varicose and mixed pattern of crypt opening were the independent predictors for SSLs with dysplasia by multifactorial logistic regression analysis. This study was conducted well, and the methods are appropriate. The results will be of interest to clinicians in the field. However, the following major and minor issues require clarification: Major 1. Previous studies have already reported the endoscopic characteristics in SSLs with dysplasia. The authors should comment the strength (novelty and originality) in this study. Minor 1. An abbreviation of SSL is used for two meanings, that is, serrated sessile lesion in a broad sense and serrated sessile lesion without dysplasia, which seems somewhat confusing. Please modify the latter one. 2. (P8L13-15) “The independent diagnostic factors of colorectal SSL-D serve as positive guidelines for the colonoscopist's immediate endoscopic diagnosis.” This sentence should be described in the discussion section as it is not a result. 3. (Discussion) The first paragraph should be described in
Introduction section. 4. (P12L3-4) “Second, all cases included in this study were precancerous adenocarcinomas, which could lead to discrepancies in the findings.” I can’t understand this description of limitation. Please explain it in more detail.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank you for revising the manuscript according to my suggestion. The revised manuscript is improved enough to be accepted.