Dear Editor,

We are pleased that our manuscript has been accepted for publication in your journal and we would like to thank the journal for the rapid review process.

We would like to answer in every well-stated comment superlatively.

1. **Reviewer #1:**

   Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

   Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

   Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

   Specific Comments to Authors: As you addressed in Discussion, this review has a critical weakness, i.e., low external valdity. This review covered a small number of retrospective studies with a small number of participants. But the topic is very important and the review is truly meticulous. In this context, this review will be a great starting point in this direction.

   Authors' answer: We would like to thank the reviewer for the kind well-stated comment. All the above mentioned limitations are also stated in the discussion section. The manuscript has been reviewed by a native English-speaker.

2. **Reviewer #2:**

   Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

   Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

   Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

   Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript perfomed a meta-analysis a meta-analysis were perfomed in this manuscript to reveal the role of MVD in differentiated thyroid carcinoma (DTC), and the coclusion is that MVD significantly correlates with the survival outcomes of patients with thyroid cancer.The results of this manuscript is meaningful. However, there are still some details to be revised: 1. Several abbreviations need explanation when they first appear, such as "FTCs", MTCs, "PTC" 2. The subtitle in the flow chart is not very clear. For example, "1626 studies excluded" is subtitle, but not a paralleled list wirh "125 non human studies"

   Authors' answer: We would like to thank the reviewer for the kind well-stated comment. We have added the explanation of the abbreviations the first time that they were used. The flow chart has been modified accordingly. The manuscript has been reviewed by a native English-speaker.

3. **Science editor:** The meta-analysis of this manuscript evaluates the impact of tumor MVD on the survival of DTC patients. When the abbreviation appears for the first time, please supplement the full English name, subtitle in the flow chart is not very clear, please correct.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Authors' answer: We would like to thank the editor for the kind well-stated comment. We have added the explanation of the abbreviations the first time that they were used. The manuscript has been reviewed by a native English-speaker.

4. **Company editor-in-chief:** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Methodology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

Authors' answer: We would like to thank the editor for the kind well-stated comment. The original figures have been uploaded in a power point file and the tables have been modified accordingly. The manuscript has been reviewed by a native English-speaker.