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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The incidence of IBD and colorectal neoplasia (CRN) is not decreasing and is even increasing in some countries. The study is highly relevant as it evaluates the risk of CRN in patients with IBD and post-inflammatory polyps (PIPs). The study is well planned and complies with the PRISMA 2009 statement. The meta-analysis of 12 high-quality observational studies including nearly 6000 patients (including 2000 with PIPs) indicated that IBD patients with PIPs had a 2-fold increased risk of CRN. The author's findings may have implications for clinical practice as they may provide personified endoscopic surveillance strategies for IBD patients. It is important that reviewed study confirmed the guideline for more aggressive colonoscopy of IBD patients with PIPs and improved the evidence. The authors clearly described the existing limitations, which do not reduce the quality of the study results. Literary references are relevant, without self-citation. The manuscript can certainly be recommended for publication.