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Author’s response to reviews:

Rebuttal letter

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Outcomes of General Anesthesia versus Conscious Sedation for Stroke Undergoing Endovascular Treatment: A Meta-analysis”. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewers’ comments are as following:

Ozan Akça (Reviewer 1):

I would like to thank the authors for their hard work in responding the reviewers' comments and improving their manuscript. Please find a few more comments below:

Point 1:
Abstract - As reported in your response to the reviewers, I suggest adding the "differences in worsened outcomes do not exist when one looks into the GA vs. CS randomized-controlled trials".

Reply 1:

Thanks for your suggestions. We have added the results of RCT subgroup into abstract section (Abstract section, line 65-73, page 3-4).

Point 2:

Similarly, in the Discussion and Conclusion statement, I suggest the authors cautioning about the totally different results of the RCT anesthesia intervention studies. Overall, meta-analysis may represent a statistically strong difference between the mortality and neurological outcomes favoring CS, but the smaller RCT, which randomized anesthesia intervention shows totally the opposite (outcomes similar or better in GA). This discrepancy clearly needs to be mentioned in the Discussion.

Reply 2: Thanks for your suggestions. The totally different results of the RCT anesthesia intervention studies which were added into the Discussion and Conclusion sections (Discussion sections, line 260-262, page 12; line 340-347, page 16. Conclusion sections, line 372-373, page 17).

Point 3:

Figures - I suggest the authors to add which side of "1" favors CS vs. GA. This would make readers to understand the figures without even reading the relevant text.

Reply 3: Thanks for your suggestions. We have added legends into the figures according to your suggestions (Figure 2; Figure 3; Figure S1; Figure S2).