

Reply to the reviewers' comments

We would like to thank the reviewer's for a careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which have been helpful to improve the quality of this manuscript.

Reviewer Number	Original comments of the reviewers	Reply by the author(s)	Changes done on page number and line number
1	Title The authors conducted a study on the "Prevalence of Precancerous Lesions and Conditions in India: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." However, a title is not self-explanatory. Which precancerous lesion? Please specify it.	Title We have checked all precancerous lesions and have described them throughout the article, which explains the title.	
	Abstract: Introduction: Please write about precancerous lesions, and then state the problem and reason for conducting this study. Conclusion:	Introduction Have corrected this section as mentioned by the reviewer.	Page no. 1

<p>Write a feasible, doable recommendation.</p>	<p>Correction have been made accordingly</p>	
<p>Methods</p> <p>Quality assessment</p> <p>The authors should list the domains of quality assessment tools. Moreover, they should state the source for these domains.</p> <p>Literature search</p> <p>Fig. 1: The authors excluded 30 studies after review of abstracts and 3 studies after review of full texts. Please write the reason for the exclusion.</p> <p>Data analysis</p> <p>How did the authors estimate the statistical heterogeneity among the studies? And how did they declare the level of statistical significance?</p> <p>Did the authors check the publication bias?</p>	<p>Method</p> <p>Quality assessment</p> <p>All the domains are added in the manuscript.</p> <p>Literature search</p> <p>Fig.1: corrections have been made accordingly</p> <p>Data analysis</p> <p>The heterogeneity was measured according to the study designs and sample size, area where study was conducted.</p> <p>Yes, as mentioned earlier throughout the process of ROB publication bias was been checked.</p>	

<p>Results</p> <p>The authors have reported the pooled prevalence of precancerous lesions in the age group from childhood up to adulthood. Why? Did the author think of the variation in prevalence between the childhood and adulthood periods? What was the author's recommendation?</p> <p>“Heterogeneity was high.”How much?</p> <p>The authors failed to provide the characteristics of the included studies, such as study tools, population, sample size, and sampling procedures.</p>	<p>Result</p> <p>In India, researches have reported that habit of tobacco consumption develops in early adulthood and chances of developing precancerous lesions increases two fold. Hence, authors choose to measure the prevalence amongst childhood up to adulthood and found the significant difference amongst the age group.</p> <p>Characteristics of included studies have been mentioned.</p>	
<p>Discussion:</p> <p>The authors should compare and contrast the pooled prevalence of precancerous lesions with studies from different regions and countries and formulate a solution and possible doable recommendation.</p>	<p>Discussion</p> <p>Have tried to compare the lesions and reported it in discussion.</p>	