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Title: The effects of psychological interventions on depression and anxiety among Chinese adults with cancer: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies

Dear Sir or Madam,

We have re-revised the manuscript by Yi-Long Yang et al. entitled “The effects of psychological interventions on depression and anxiety among Chinese adults with cancer: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies”. We follow the editor advice and addressed all of these concerns of Referee 1 (Ayako Matsuda). According to the reviewer’s question and advice, we have provided a point-by-point description of the changes made as follows.

Reviewer’s report

Version: 19 November 2014

Reviewer: Ayako Matsuda

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Methods:

You provided the information about timing of assessment in Table 1 (supplementary). You should discuss the effects of the different timing of assessment because of the too various timing (EXAMPLE: pre-surgery, post-surgery, 1 year post discharge). As shown on page 10, line 20, effect size in this meta-analysis is SMD. You should correct to “Mean and SD”.

Answer: According to the reviewer’s advice, we have discussed the effects of the different timing of assessment. However, because of the too various timing (e.g., pre-surgery, post-surgery, 1 year post discharge), we chose the same time point (post-treatment or post-intervention) and the specified time range (days, weeks and
months) so that it could be categorized, compared and calculated. We have done
moderator analysis using the item “Timing of assessment” as a moderator variable,
but no moderating effects were found.

As shown on page 13, line 15, and Table 3.

We also corrected the “effect size” to “Mean and SD”.

As shown on page 10, line 20.

2. Statistical analysis:

In Table 3, there were the following descriptions, “P of comparison between these
subgroups”.

You should add statistical method and reference about it in Table 3.

Answer: According to the reviewer’s advice, we added statistical method and
reference about it in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3.

3. Figure 3, Figure 4:

You added the following sentence in the figures, “Favors experimental group” and
“Favors control group”.

I think that a position is reverse.

In Cumulative meta-analysis, you should indicate into each Figure 3 or Figure 4 in
parallel, not additional files and discuss the results of it if you show the Cumulative
meta-analysis.

Answer: According to the reviewer’s advice, we corrected the position of “Favors
experimental group” and “Favors control group” in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

As shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4.
According to the reviewer’s advice, we indicate cumulative meta-analysis (Figure 5 and Figure 6) into Figure 3/Figure 4 in parallel, instead of additional files, and we also discussed the results of cumulative meta-analysis in the present study.

As shown on page 3, line 2-5; page 14, line 6-10; page 18, line 1-8; page 19, line 10-15 and in Figure 5 and Figure 6.