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Author's response to reviews

The following is a point-to-point response to the two reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 2:

1# At the first revision, the reviewer suggested that the author may need to include the results of the latest published researches. However, the authors did not answer this question in the revised manuscript, and the researches included in the meta-analysis remained unchanged, only citing a few more articles in their part of discussion. Considering the current vision of the submission and the author's ignoring to our questions, I may suggest it to be rejected.

Response: Thank you for the comments. Firstly, it was our mistake that we did not include all the powerful evidences until now for the limitation of time and effort.

Secondly, recently a similar meta-analysis < Clinical outcomes after hybrid coronary revascularization versus coronary artery bypass surgery: a meta-analysis of 1,190 patients > by Harskamp et al was published in <American Heart Journal>, and the conclusions of our study was quite similar to those of this study. Besides, most studies included in this study were part of ten studies in our analysis. Therefore, we assume that our evidence may be as
powerful as this meta-analysis.

Finally I hope you can reconsider our manuscript and we are looking forward to your favorable decision sincerely.