Reviewer #1:

Q1) The authors developed a tool based on machine learning to evaluate the incidence of colorectal adenomas and adenoma detection rates in hepatitis C patients. The idea of the article is good, but I am very disappointed with the structure, standardization, and experimental design of the article

Answer) Thank you for your warm words of encouragement. We have modified the structure and design of the article. We have worked on the structure, standardization of references and cross checked the grammar and punctuation. We hope you find it better now. Thank you for your time in reviewing our manuscript.

Q2) The authors should modify the article format according to the standards of journal articles.

Answer) Thank you for that, we have modified the article in concordance with the format of World Journal of Hepatology now.

Q3) The highest accuracy of the author's model is 56%. Whether the parameters of the author's model have been optimized. The author's model has not been tested with independent data or cross verified, and the accuracy and stability of the model need further evaluation. There is no statistical comparison with the existing models. ——In addition, the authors said: The models can operate either in the presence or absence of the parameters (age, smoking history, significant alcohol consumption, aspirin intake, ethnicity, HCV status, gender, BMI, and colonoscopy findings). How about the accuracy and stability of the model in case of missing data. It should be verified.

Answer) We have added information on the same and included a new Table 4 to elucidate the stability of the various models tested.

Q4) The introduction, methods and discussion of the article need to be improved.

Answer) We have reformatted these areas and hope you find it better.

Q5) Line 191, there is an extra space after "help". ——Line 201, The "p" should be italicized. ——Line 251, there is an extra space before "HCV". ——Line 277, there is an extra space before "MLD". ——Line 303, "focussed", spelling mistakes.

Answer) All of the above-mentioned errors have been rectified. I hope you enjoy our manuscript now.

Reviewer #2:

Q) The abstract is not convincing and is disorganized, it should be refined to precisely illustrate what authors have done in this paper within 200 words.

Answer) Thank you for your time and advice. We have refurbished the abstract as per your advice. We hope you find it short and succinct now.

Q) Some variables weren't defined appropriately.

Answer) We have relabeled the variables in the demographics table to ensure clarity. Please let us know your thoughts now. Thank you.

Q) 4- Result and Discussion section is inadequate. Need more attention and better explanation. 5- I suggest extending the conclusions section to focus on the results you get, the method you propose, and their significance. 6- References aren't formatted according to rules. 7- Please, explain all the variables used in any of the equations within the manuscript.

Answer) All of the above-mentioned points are with regards to formatting, so we are addressing this as one question. We have worked on the explanation and conclusion segments to improve the flow of the manuscript. We have now portrayed the method in the form of an elaborate strobe diagram along with a better conclusion. We have made

the variables cleared in the tables. We have also edited the references in accordance with the rules of the journal. We hope you enjoy our manuscript now. Thank you for your time.

<u>Re-reviewer #1:</u>

Comment: The authors have addressed all my concerns.

Answer: Thanks for your comments.

<u>Re-reviewer #2:</u>

Comment: In. the revised manuscript, the authors have addressed all my concerns. Overall, this work is in good. I suggest to accept this manuscript.

Answer: Thanks for your comments.