

March 26, 2016.

Dr. Damian Garcia-Olmo, Dr. Stephen C Strom, and Dr. Andrzej S Tarnawski

Editors-in-Chief, *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Dear Drs. Garcia-Olmo, Strom, and Tarnawski,

Thank you very much for inviting us to resubmit our manuscript, “**A meta-analysis of efficacy and adverse events of cold vs. hot polypectomy.**” The reviewers provided excellent suggestions and guidance, and we have now revised our manuscript in accordance with their suggestions.

All of the revisions have now been highlighted in red for ease of review, and our point-by-point responses to the reviewers appear below. We believe that the reviewers’ suggestions have helped us to substantially improve the quality of the manuscript. We sincerely hope that all of the reviewers’ concerns have been sufficiently addressed and would like to request that the revised manuscript again be considered for publication in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Point-by-point responses

We wish to express our appreciation to the Reviewer for his or her insightful comments, which have helped us significantly improve the paper.

Comment 1: *Title should be no more than 10~12 words/60 bytes.*

Response: We apologize for the oversight and have changed the title as follows: “A meta-analysis of efficacy and adverse events of cold vs. hot polypectomy”.

Comment 2: *Please provide the postal code. And check throughout.*

Response: We apologize for the oversight and have now added the postal code for each author’s address.

Comment 3: *Authors are required to make these statements in the manuscript’s title page.*

Response: We apologize for the oversight and have now declared on the title page our lack of any conflict of interest and stated that we have no additional data available related to this paper.

Comment 4: *Please write a summary of less than 100 words to outline the most innovative and important arguments and core contents in your paper to attract readers.*

Response: In accordance with the Reviewer’s suggestion, we have inserted this “core tip” section in the main manuscript.

Comment 5: *In order to attract readers to read your full-text article, we request that the author make an audio file describing your final core tip, it is necessary for final acceptance. Please refer to Instruction to authors on our website or attached Format for detailed information.*

Response: In accordance with the Reviewer’s suggestion, we made now created an mp3 audio file recording of the “core tip”.

Comment 6: *Please reformat all the reference numbers (superscript with square brackets).*

Response: We have now reformatted the references in compliance with journal standards.

Comment 7: *Please provide the “Highlighted contents” here, which is a necessary content.*

Response: In accordance with the Reviewer’s suggestion, we have added text highlighting the contents this article, as stipulated in the guidelines.

Comment 8: *Please add PubMed citation numbers and DOI citation to the reference list and list all authors. Please revise throughout.*

Response: We have now added DOI and PMID numbers for all reference articles. As some articles seemed to lack DOI numbers, we have instead attached the first page of these articles.

Comment 9: *The graphs supplied should be **decomposable** (each part of your figure could be moved so as to easily edited). You can send it as excel, word or PPT format so that I can edit them easily.*

Response: We apologize for the confusion and have now inserted the graphs and figures in a decomposable format in the main manuscript. We have also attached these graphs and figures in their original format.