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Reviewer's report:

The written English in your revised manuscript is much improved with the assistance of the American Journal Experts. There are still some sentences and words that need to be edited. I advise against using "etc." in any sentence.

In Methods section, I recommend revising your last sentence under Patients: "after considering the comprehensive conditions, such as growth pattern, tumor location, etc." Please state the conditions that were used to make the decision and not use "etc".

In your study, you have 94 patients that were eligible and of these 13 were laparoscopic. You did not describe in your methods how you chose the matched 13 open patients out of the 81 remaining. I think this is important for the reader to know in order to understand the amount of bias.

In Table 1, you are missing a patient in risk classification LAP group: 6 intermediate/6 high, yet you have 13 patients in this group.

There are many limitations to your systematic review. However, you did a good job clearly stating them in your discussion thereby allowing to reader to understand the data leading to your conclusions.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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