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Dear Sir/Madam,

Point-by-point response
Thank you for your helpful advice and comments for improving the manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to your advice and comments. The following are our responses to your specific comments:

I would suggest the protocol is reviewed for use of the English language throughout. In the last paragraph before Methods/Design
"The changes of glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) and fasting plasma glucose (FPG) from baselines will be determined". This sentence represent poorly constructed English.

Thanks for your suggestion. This sentence has been changed as “This meta-analysis aims to evaluate the efficacy of dapagliflozin in combination with conventional anti-diabetic drugs for glucose control as measured by the changes of glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c) and fasting plasma glucose (FPG).”

For example under eligibility criteria most sentences start with "the studies with....will be excluded/included" where the phrase "the studies” is usually unnecessary. The meaning is clear though out, however the quality of the language should be improved.

Thanks for your suggestion. The phrase in eligibility criteria has been replaced as “the RCTs”.

Searches - these seem somewhat limited and I was unsure why EMBASE is not included. There was no indication of planned attempts to seek unpublished or commercial literature to reduce potential publication bias.

Thanks for your suggestion. We have added Embase into the list of bibliographical databases. We will also use Google and manual search to find unpublished reports and supplementary data.

Quality assessment - the Jadad scale is no longer considered best practice when assessing studies for potential bias, since it reflects reporting rather than underlying reliability. Suggest the authors consider a more up-to-date option such as the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool. No indication of how study reliability will be taken into account within the synthesis.

Thank you for your suggestion. We will use the Cochrane’s risk of bias tool to assess the quality of the eligible RCTs. Furthermore, GRADE profiler will be used to assess the evidential quality. Sensitivity analysis will be conducted. The manuscript has been thoroughly revised and is now submitted for your reconsideration.

Yours faithfully,
The authors