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Author’s response to reviews:
We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the reviewers and editor for their constructive and positive comments.

Editor Comments: The manuscript is of interest for the Journal but you still need to address properly the initial comments and criticism made by Reviewer #2. He has initially made the following comments: "The article is written in poor English. It is a meta-analysis made on the basis of non-randomized clinical trials, mainly on retrospective series with a limited number of patients enrolled. Those studies have no details on the patient selection for minimally invasive access and considering that the majority of them derived from Eastern series with a high prevalence of early stage disease, no main conclusion can be drawn. Clinical stage in relation with type of operation is not clear in the studies considered from the authors. Also there is not a clear distinction between total and subtotal gastrectomy, so the differences in indications and results among the two proposed technique is not clear." You still need to at least acknowledge the limitations of the present study and explain why, if this is the case, was not possible to make the distinction requested by the reviewer between total and subtotal gastrectomy, as well as details on patients selection, possible biases due to the selection of Eastern world series and
explain better the relationship between clinical stage and type of operation. Last but not least please get the paper revised by an English mother tongue reviewer or a professional editing service. As far as I know, BMC has some agreements with some Editing Professionals.

Answer: We have rewritten the limitations in Discussion section, in which we have acknowledged our article’s shortcoming. Also, Hendi Maher from Australia had carefully helped to edit and polish the English language.