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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks to the authors for this well-organised study. There are two major limitations of the study; First, retrospectively designed, Second, there are 11 different endoscopists in the study. Endoscopists are likely to have different skill levels. I think that those weaken the impact of the study.