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Reviewer's report:

A metaanalysis on a very trendy topic. However the paper is still in lack of some serious questions to be answered.

1. The number of the segmentectomy and wedge resections and survival data of these patients compared with each other and also with lobectomy should be included.

2. "This phenomenon may be attributed to the following reasons: First, elderly with NSCLC are often afflicted with comorbidity, so perioperative management is more complex. The main reasons for equivalent oncological outcomes in elderly undergoing sub-lobar resection compared to those undergoing standard lobectomy are reduced postoperative complication, less surgical stress and better preservation of the pulmonary function. Second, the elderly are often associated with other age-related diseases and have a short life expectancy. As a result, they died of other diseases rather than lung cancer. Last, due to the particularity of the elderly, the tumor may be less invasive than the younger's." Appropriate references must be added to each information given in the paragraph.

3. "258 However, no randomized controlled trials existing in this field to comparing lobectomy with sub-lobar resection have been conducted." There is one and that is reference 15 in the article.

4. The survivals of age groups of 70-74, 75-79 and 80 and over should be given if present in the studies mentioned in the article.
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