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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The limitations are well pointed out, but even within the same institution, the results could have been different depending on the competence of the endoscopists performing the procedure. Also, in the conclusion, DM was used as a significant predictor, but in the table, the calculation guidance should have been 50%, but it was incorrectly shown as 0.5, so it will be important to check if it is actually correct. Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)