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Dear editors of BMC Surgery,

We have revised our manuscript “Single- Versus Two- Layer Intestinal Anastomosis: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized controlled Trials” (manuscript No. 3108561095761579) in light of the reviewer’s comments and uploaded the 2nd revised version.

We appreciate thoughtful reviewer’s comment, thank you.

And thank you for your kind consideration,

Satoru Shikata, M.D.
E-mail: shikata@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp

A list of all changes in the revised manuscript:

(1) In the “conclusion” section of the abstract:
   We deleted the sentence of “no advantage is derived…,” and we put the following sentence in the conclusion section of the abstract.

   - No evidence was found that two-layer intestinal anastomosis leads to fewer post-operative leaks than single layer.

(2) In the “Discussion-limitations” section:
   We revised the sentences “First, the study by Goligher et al. had …” according to reviewer’s comment.

   First, the study by Goligher et al. had a substantial influence on the combined risk ratio. However, the main conclusion of a lack of evidence for an advantage of two-layer over single-layer anastomosis is unaffected, as the result of a sensitivity analysis excluding this study was more favorable to single-layer.

(3) In the “Results-Exploring sources of heterogeneity and sensitivity analysis” section:
   The phrase “none of the variables for year of publication,” was changed to:
   “neither year of publication, mean age of study participants, nor percentage of male”

(4) In the “Discussion” section:
   The sentence “Although one possible explanation of this high rate of leaks may be caused by their inclusion criteria, high and low colorectal anastomosis, it is inexplicable for all”.
was replaced by the following sentence:

- One possible explanation of this high rate of leaks may be their inclusion criteria, high and low colorectal anastomosis.

(5) In the “Discussion” section:
We deleted “To say the least,” in the sentence “To say the least, this suture technique is not common in intestinal anastomosis in the present day.”

(6) In the “Discussion-limitation” section:
“Secondly, quality of” was changed to “Secondly, the quality of”.

(7) Table 2, in exclusion criteria of Everett’s study:
“so low in the pelvis” was replaced to:
- extra-peritoneal anastomosis