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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:

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:

Point 1:

The statement on heterogeneity cutoffs in the methods section is not clear. The statement does not address heterogeneity of less than 25%. Please provide ranges for low, moderate and high heterogeneity cutoffs.

Reply 1:
Thanks for your questions. As you suggested, we have revised our statement in method section. To determine the degree of heterogeneity among the studies included in our meta-analysis, the I-squared (I²) statistic and the Cochran Q test were used, with I² values less than 25% representing low heterogeneity, 25~50% representing moderate heterogeneity, and more than 75% representing high heterogeneity, respectively. The reference for the I² value cutoffs in the methods section also was listed (Methods section, line 174-178, page 8-9).