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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor:

Thank you for your letter and for the editors’ and reviewer’s comments concerning our manuscript entitled 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 main corrections in the paper and the responds to the editors’ comments are as flowing.

Editor Comments:
1) Please remove Figure titles/legends from the results section. These should only be listed after the References.

We removed the Figure titles/legends from the results section to the section after the References.

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:
(1) MOOSE guidelines are recommended for meta-analysis of observational studies. Were the guidelines followed? Please provide a MOOSE checklist if guidelines were followed.
The MOOSE checklist is provided as the Supplemental material.

(2) Why was the search restricted by published language? Restriction by language is not recommended. Thanks for your valuable suggestion. As we mentioned in the Discussion section, there is also a bias for the English language. It is regretful that the authors only command the English and Chinese. It’s difficult for us to read articles in other languages. And most researches are published in English nowadays. Thanks for your valuable suggestion. In the future, we will find cooperators who command other languages to expand our search scope, such as French, Germany and Japanese et.

(3) The authors should provide the complete search strategy for at least one research database. Thanks for your valuable suggestion. The complete search strategy in PubMed is provide in the Methods section.

(4) Please provide a reference for the interpretation of the I2 statistic (heterogeneity). The reference for the interpretation of the I2 statistic is provided as reference 14.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Apart from the above suggestions, I would suggest a separate section within the Discussion section to describe the limitations of the study and to moderate the findings from this study.

We stress the limitations of our research in the last paragraph of Discussion section.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
The manuscript needs substantial reworking for sentence formation, language and grammar.

Our manuscript is revised by a native English speaker. Thanks.