Author’s response to reviews

Title: Efficacy and safety of target combined chemotherapy in advanced gastric cancer: a Meta-analysis and system review

Authors:

kun zou (ZK907030@163.COM)
Xiong Bin (bixiong1961@whu.edu.cn)
Shuailong Yang (324317952@qq.com)
Liang Zheng (1258523913@qq.com)
Chaogang Yang (598117497@qq.com)

Version: 1 Date: 31 Jul 2016

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Efficacy and safety of target combined chemotherapy in advanced gastric cancer: a Meta-analysis and system review”. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our research. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction, which we hope meet with approval.

The revisions made in the revised manuscript are listed as follows:

1/ Title page: On page 1, line 4-10,

Authors’ information were revised and provided a more explicit institution address of the all authors.


All abbreviations were removed (e.g. HR, OR, 95%CI, EGFR, VEGFR, OS, PFS, ORR).

3/ Manuscript: On page 4, line 21-22; page 5, line 1-2. Page 9, line 14-19; page 10, line 5-8; page 11, line 17-20; page 13, line 10-12;

Abbreviations used less than 3 times were removed (e.g. NCCN, HER-2). For a more explicit description of the subgroups, we revised anti EGFR/selected, anti EGFR/unselected, anti VEGFR/unselected to anti-EGFR target drugs for selected, anti-EGFR target drugs for unselected, anti-VEGFR target drugs for unselected patients subgroups, respectively.
4/ Figure legends: On page 20, line 8-12.

A abbreviation of the figures was added.

5/ Figures: figures resized, Figure 4 replaced. The name of the subgroups showed in figure 4 was revised and consistent with that showed in figure 2,3.

We have tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper.

Responds to the reviewers’ comments:

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: As written, the paper is virtually unreadable and cannot be evaluated at this time due to a large number of structural problems. Until these are fixed, the review cannot progress forward.

I will comment that in general, the writing style seems OK.

Response to comment: “1. The paper has massive abuse of abbreviations. All abbreviations must be defined on their first use, even commonly used ones. The authors have a list of abbreviations that is dishonestly short. Many are not on the list (e.g. GR, CI, RCT, NCCN, HER-2). There should be NO abbreviations in the abstract. Nearly all of the abbreviations in the paper should be removed except the commonly used ones. Only abbreviations used more than 3 times should remain as abbreviations. ”

1/ Response: Consider the reviewer’s suggestion, we removed some abbreviations that was used less than 3 times (e.g. NCCN, HER-2). For the abstract, we removed all abbreviations (e.g. HR, OR, 95%CI, EGFR, VEGFR, OS, PFS, ORR). For a more explicit description of the subgroups, we anti EGFR/selected, anti EGFR/unselected, anti VEGFR/unselected to anti EGFR target drugs for selected, anti EGFR target drugs for unselected, anti VEGFR target drugs for unselected patients subgroups, respectively.

2/ Response to comment: “Tables are placed at the end of the paper, one table per page”

Response: Following the reviewer’s suggestion, we replaced the tables 1-3 at the end of the paper

3/ Response to comment: “The paper must be double spaced, 12 point Times New Roman”

Response: We have made correction according to your suggestion.

4/ Response to comment: “The paper should not be right justified”

Response: We have made correction according to your suggestion and the paper has been justified align.
5/ Response to comment: “All numbers less than 10 should be written as words (e.g. page 6, lines 48-54)”

Response: We have made correction according to your suggestion and all numbers less than 10 in the manuscript have been written as words.

6/ Response to comment: “Two small errors are noted at this time: 1. Page 11, line 8: "trails" 2. Page 6, line 17 "Cocran's"

Response: We have corrected the errors.

Thank you for taking time to review our manuscript and give valuable comments. We have made correction according to the reviewer’s comment. Special thanks to you for your good comments.

We appreciate for Editors and Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Bin Xiong