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Reviewer's report:

Study question:
I read the article with interest. The goal of the study has been clearly stated. The main objective of presented meta-analysis was to evaluate 1- 3- and 5- year survival in patients after 70 years of age with stage I non-small cell lung cancer who received lobectomy or sublobar resection (segmentectomy or wedge resection). The study question is clinically relevant and not have been convincingly demonstrated in clinical trials.
Comment 1:
Please add more recent publications at the background and discussion.

Literature search:
The authors conducted a comprehensive literature search, the most important databases of online resources were used. Number of included and excluded studies have been provided as well as reasons for exclusion.
Comment 2:
The literature search process should be described in more detail. The authors have not reported how many researchers were involved in the literature search. How many abstracts and full texts have been reviewed by how many authors? Did you review the titles/abstracts/full texts independently?
Comment 3:
Did you attempt to collect any unpublished data?
Comment 4:
You should describe the quality assessment of the selected studies in more detail.

Evaluation of results:
Comment 4:
Did you use structured abstraction form?
Comment 5:
There is insufficient information about selected studies (lack of patient's demographics, inclusion and exclusion criteria for each study, 1-, 3- and 5-year survival of each study).
Comment 6:
You should more precisely describe the process of exclusion of the studies.
Comment 7:
You wrote that you have performed a sensitivity analysis (in the title statistical and sensitivity analyses). Can you describe in more detail the sensitivity analysis?

Comment 8:
I have also concerns about the assessment of the publication bias. The funnel plot was presented with annotation that it showed asymmetry and it might suggest the publication bias. I think that you should comment that in the discussion.

Summary:
The objective of the presented meta-analysis is clinically relevant and was well described. Although the assessment of only 1-, 3- and 5-year survivals does not exhaust this topic. What about post-operative complications or recurrence rate? Please comment.

Minor comments:
1. I suggest that the article be reviewed by an English native speaker.
2. In the table 1 the studies do not refer to the appropriate references.

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.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.