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Dear editor,
Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We have revised the manuscript, and would like to re-submit it for your consideration. We have addressed the two comments you raised, and the amendments are highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. Point by point responses to your comments is listed below this letter. As one reviewer (Sebastien Viatte) think that our manuscript still needs some language corrections before being published, we have made some corrections on our written language. We hope that the revised version of the manuscript is now acceptable for publication in your journal.
I look forward to hearing from you soon.
With best wishes,
Yours sincerely,
Wuning Mo
Corresponding author
Dear editor,
Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We are very grateful to your comments for our manuscript. We would like to express our sincere thanks to you for the constructive and positive comments.
Based on your comment and request, we have made modification on our manuscript. Here, we attached revised manuscript with the correction sections red marked, which was attached in the formats of MS word for your approval. A Cover letter answering every question from you was also summarized and enclosed.

1. This following abstract sentence is confusing and must be clarified (interaction of the polymorphisms with which factors on the susceptibility of cervical cancer?)
   “However, larger scale primary studies are still required to further evaluate the interaction of Fas -670A/G polymorphism with cervical cancer susceptibility”
   **Answer:** Correction has been made in the revised version. As the eligible studies included in our meta-analysis did not provide sufficient primary data such as dietary habits and people’s lifestyles, we could not further evaluate the potential interactions between gene-gene and gene-environment. So that we think that larger scale primary studies with the consideration of gene–gene and gene–environment interactions are still required to further evaluate the interaction of Fas rs180082 polymorphism with cervical cancer susceptibility.

2. Instead of using all through the manuscript the terminology "Fas -670A/G polymorphism", the authors should use the corresponding rsID.
   **Answer:** "Fas -670A/G polymorphism" has changed into “Fas rs180082 polymorphism” all through the manuscript.