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Reviewer's report:

Major Comments

- Authors must completely revise the manuscript since there are several English language and grammar errors in the manuscript that should be corrected. Authors should request the help of a native English speaker to help them to rewrite the manuscript all over.

- Title: it is not necessary to refer the number of subjects in the study in the title, moreover, this number is the sum of cases and controls, therefore readers could be influenced by the title.

- Introduction: It is not clear why the authors have chosen the -670A/G Fas polymorphism... Is there a plausible biological role? Were there many studies performed? What were the main results from previous studies? Are there any other important SNPs on this gene?

- Methodology: Authors did not use a correct methodology for meta-analysis design: 1) authors have not used a true QUERY for search publications, the use of specific words is not always correlated with the MESH terms and therefore it is probable that the number of articles to be included can be higher; 2) in inclusion and exclusion criteria authors have used unspecific terms that did not provide a specific significance to the criteria (e.g. "genotypes or other information that could be used infer the results");

- Results and Discussion: Authors should separate these two parts, since in results it is only important to summarize the results from the risk analysis, sensitivity analysis and heterogeneity tests.

- Discussion: 1) Authors should start by summarizing the biological role for this polymorphism and relevance for either clinical or epidemiological studies; 2) biases to the study should be addressed (e.g. number of studies, search criteria, type of population, number of cases in each study, etc...); 3) since the number of manuscripts is very short (n=6) authors, should be more prone to discuss the results and make critics to them individually or grouped by result.

- Conclusions: Conclusions are usually a summary of the major results of the study and not a description of data and studies... this is more likely to be used in conclusion.

Minor Comments:
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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