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1. It seems to be a bit astonishing, that only 7 studies met the inclusion criteria. I really wonder, if exclusion only be means of the abstract content might be reason for that - I would like the authors to comment on that issue.

   The process of literature survey was as follows. We yielded 192 records through the basic strategy. Fifty-four full texts were screened by titles, abstracts and key words. We read 54 articles intensively apart from the abstract. Most studies did not report the data we needed. The including criterion of follow-up time and the number of patients would ensure the credibility of our study. Finally, seven studies were included in the meta-analysis.

2. I suggest to remove Table 2, as it gives no essential information.

   We agree to remove Table 2. But we took the final score of the evaluation into Table 1.

3. For part of methods:
   Please describe more detail about how “Funnel plots” were employed to assess the possibility of publication bias.

   We have mentioned your concern in our article: it implies minimal publication bias when all studies are within the 95% CI and are distributed evenly about the vertical. Funnel plots are rarely used when a small number of articles are contained. Besides, we already focused main energy on sensitivity analysis. So the funnel plots is not appropriate in our case. And we remove it.

   English writing have been corrected.