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Dear Editor:

“Endovascular coiling versus neurosurgical clipping in patients with unruptured intracranial aneurysm: a systematic review”

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript.

Sincerely,
MK Hyun, PH.D.

Response to Reviewers

Reviewer #1:
Q. The article has major impact on daily practice. However, there are no informations about aneurysm-size or -location and about aneurysmrest after treatment in this article. The authors have mentioned this in their discussion. But this limits the statement of this study.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

A : Thank you for the accurate comment.
According to the reviewer comments, we already mentioned the following sentence in the discussion.
“The information about size/location of aneurysms in the selected studies was either not found or was useless because treatment outcomes were not reported for each size and location.”.
Within the limits, we have conducted comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis comparing clipping and coiling in patients with UIA. It is very meaningful.

The authors really appreciated the reviewer’s kind and accurate comments. Revision based on these comments has improved the accuracy and the quality of the manuscript. We appreciate your efforts.