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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editors,

Thank you for your letter and for the comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Meta-analysis comparing laparoscopic versus open resection for gastric gastrointestinal stromal tumors larger than 5 cm” (ID: BCAN-D-17-00324). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for improving the quality of our paper. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope to meet your submission requirements. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the editors’s comments are as flowing:
1. Response to comment: The overall quality of the written English throughout this manuscript submission is SUBOPTIMAL, and it is so on many levels (including word-tense errors, inappropriate word utilization and selection, punctuation error, and suboptimal sentence structure, throughout the entire text of the entire manuscript submission).

Response: We do realize the inappropriate written English expression of the paper after browsing the full paper, and thank you for your understanding that English is not our primary native language, after all. To improve this problem, we have sought out American Journal Experts to improve upon all aspects of the overall quality of written English, and have revised the whole paper according to their professional revised opinions. The revised manuscript has been resubmitted to the ‘attach files’ with the documentation of editorial certification from American Journal Experts as Supplementary Material.

2. Response to comment: manuscript cross-checking software program CrossCheck/iThenticate demonstrated a CrossCheck/iThenticate Score Value (i.e., Overall Similarity Score Result) of 41%, and showing that portions of the text from this manuscript submission were taken word-for-word from prior published papers!

Response: Thanks for your concerned. We are very sorry for our negligence of the similarity issue to prior published papers. We have try our best to re-written the repeat part of the paper to avoid the word-for-word problem. While, some contents of this manuscript involved the professional terms are inevitable similar to the published papers, especially in the introduction paragraph for statistical method and GRADE system in the method section. For instance, “(a) high: further research is impossible to change…”(d) very low: we have little confidence in the estimate of the effect.” in the third paragraph of “Systematic review and meta-analysis” section, and “Student’s t test or the Mann-Whitney U test… P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant” in the first paragraph of “Statistical Analysis” part. Even so, we have corrected the issue as much as possible to meet the editorial requirements.

We appreciate for Editors’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.