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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:

Maureen A. Murtaugh (Reviewer 1): There is still some awkward language, for example missing "the" or "a" as in a significant association.

Reply: Thank you for your careful review. Sorry for some mistakes we have made. We have revised the manuscript following your suggestion. Please see the revision.

Page 7 line 27—saying a Paper rather than saying a paper by (authors) is awkward.

Reply: Thank you for your attention. We have revised the sentence.

Line 50 page 7 what was the original level of between study heterogeneity?

Reply: We have provided the original level of between-study heterogeneity. Please see our revised manuscript.
Page 8 lines 13-18—how strong was the association between red meat and heart failure in the one positive study?

Reply: We have provided the RR for red meat and heart failure in the one positive study.

Line 36 page 8 Egger should be capitalized the final sentence of the results is not understandable as written.

Reply: Thank you for your careful review. We have revised our manuscript following your suggestion.

The paragraph that addresses background diet should at least include sodium as another contributor.

Reply: Thank you. We have added sodium as another contributor in the background diet section.

The second to last sentence in the last paragraph of the discussion is nonsensical.

Reply: Thank you for your careful review. We have revised that sentence.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): "REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: The authors have addressed my previous concerns and I think that the additional information and analyses improve the presentation of the findings."

Reply: Thank you for your careful review. We have revised our manuscript carefully to further improve our article. Thank you for your hard working on our manuscript.