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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear reviewers, thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We have made the necessary corrections to answer your comments. A revised version of the manuscript with visible changes (Highlighted) is submitted. We would like to report here the answers to your comments:

Reviewer #1:

Comment: Is a Fusobacterium nucleatum infection in the colon a risk factor for colorectal cancer?: A systematic review

Title: I suggest this should include meta-analysis, that is, Is a Fusobacterium nucleatum infection in the colon a risk factor for colorectal cancer?: A systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

Answer: The title is modified as suggested by the reviewer by adding Meta-analysis.

Comment: Keywords: I suggest this should include Meta-analysis

Answer: Meta-analysis is added to the list of keywords

Comment: Setting and language: Lines 41-43: I suggest Google translator be considered to help with the language restriction
Answer: The sentence is modified to: There will be no restriction by study setting. English- and French-language publications will be considered for full-text analysis in this systematic review, and eligible articles in other languages will be translated using Google Translate.

Comment: Information sources: Lines 46-61: I suggest mention should be made about date of publication of articles in the search strategy for the databases. The chosen date should be justified as well.

Answer: The following sentence is added: Since the vast majority of research conducted on this topic has been carried out in the past 10 years, the start date for the literature search will not be limited in order to maximize the number of publications considered.

Reviewer #2: this is very well written protocol and thorough written. I think overall this should be publishable. "full text analysis" should be "full-text analysis"

Answer: The correction was done as suggested