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Dear Editor,

I resubmit my manuscript to BMC Gastroenterology for publication as an "Meta-analysis". Please find enclosed manuscript with the electronic copy of the full-text in Word form at (file name VSC VERSUS SAC.doc)

Firstly, thanks a lot for reviewing. According to the suggestions of the reviewers, I have addressed the comments in my revised manuscript and provided a point-by-point response to the concerns as following:

Reviewer: Janier Sola Vera

Minor essential revisions:
1. I have corrected the misspelled words, grammatical and syntactical errors.
2. I feel terribly sorry that I have neglected the typographical error in the article by Othman et al. Now I have corrected the mistake and make a right conclusion in my article.
3. I have accepted the reviewer's advice and removed the conclusion "the VSC could be useful for patients undergoing total unsedated colonoscopy". I have rewritten the phrase "probably complicated the procedure at the mean time".

Major compulsory revisions:
1. Sensitivity analysis was performed when large heterogeneity existed between studies. Sensitivity analysis was performed to detect the effect of any one of included trials on the overall estimate by excluding one of them according to sample size. There were no significant changes to ORs or RRs and WMDs when excluding any one of the included trials.
2. I have added the excluded studies as references in the article. OR is usually applied in event of small probability (<20%) while RR is suit for any data analysis. For caution's sake, in our meta-analysis, we used RRs to reanalyze all the data previously analyzed using ORs and there were no significant changes.

Discretionary revisions:
1. There are two subgroups analysis (included both experienced and less experienced endoscopists) in the study by Yoshikawa et al., so I have analysed these results as two independently data.
2. I have deleted Figure 4.

Reviewer: Praveen Roy

Minor
1 I have corrected the misspelled words, grammatical and syntactical errors.

Major
1 I have detailed explained clinical significance in clinical practice of our study.
2 Sensitivity analysis was performed when large heterogeneity existed between studies. Sensitivity analysis was performed to detect the effect of any one of included trials on the overall estimate by excluding one of them according to sample size. There were no significant changes to ORs or RRs and WMDs when excluding any one of the included trials.

Secondly, authors’ contribution section has been re-written in detail. In addition, I have corrected the format of tables and figure cropping.

Finally, I want to thank you sincerely for your arduous work and instructive advice and I feel so sorry that so much of your precious time was wasted on my paper revision.

Thanks again for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Qin Xie, M.D.
Department of Gastroenterology
West China Hospital of Sichuan University
No. 37, Guoxue Alley, Chengdu, Sichuan Province, China
TEL: +86-13708047844
E-mail: qinxin688418@126.com