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Reviewer's report:

According to description in the paper, regarding to the efficacy and safety of endoscopic submucosal tunnel dissection for superficial esophageal neoplastic lesions, the author collected data for a total of 9 studies involving 494 patients with 518 esophageal neoplastic lesions and then conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis. The conclusion of the study was that endoscopic submucosal tunnel dissection was effective for treating superficial esophageal neoplastic lesions with high en bloc resection rate and R0 resection rate, but accompanied by a relatively high complications. However, there are some doubts which must be clarified.

1. The authors should proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical, grammatical, and syntax errors and checked all abbreviations which are defined. There are a lot of grammatical errors and nonstandard statistical words in this article.

2. Most importantly, authors should revise the manuscript according to the criteria of the Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery. For example, the Figures were very blurry and unclear. And the Figure Legend should be modified. Figure 2, 3, and 4 should include a whole description and then the description of each picture. What does it mean for "between two groups" in Figure 4?

3. In the paper, the author collected data for a total of 9 studies, but strangely, most of the studies came from China. Is the disease described in the study has a high morbidity in China? Or is there a special selectivity when the author chooses the studies to include the research? The author should focus on clarifying.

4. There is quite different of writing strategy between result and discussion section. There are a lot of repetitive description in discussion section, which should place in result section.
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