

Dear Editor-in-Chief, World Journal of Cardiology,

Dear Prof. Marco Matteo Ciccone, Prof. Ramdas G Pai, and Prof. Dimitrios Tousoulis,

Thanks a lot. We have submitted our revised manuscript entitled '**The Efficacy and Safety of a Radial Approach versus a Distal Radial Approach for Diagnostic Coronary Angiography and Percutaneous Coronary Intervention: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (No. WJC-62514)**'. We have responded to all of the reviewer's comments in the revised manuscript, and as a consequence, we feel that it is much improved. Below is our response to the comments and the revised part of the text is shown in '**red**' in the revised version.

**<Response to the Editor and Reviewers>**

We greatly appreciate your valuable suggestions.

<To the Reviewer 1>

#1. This is good meta analysis, as quoted first systematic review but, no clear conclusion is drawn.

**Answer)** We acknowledge the importance of concluding remarks. The safety of the DRA is indicated. According to the GRADE approach for the quality of reviewed reports, the certainty of the evidence was not very high in the present study. Considering these, the DRA would be recommendable. Thus, we have emphatically modified a concluding remarks with further issues (**in Abstract section on page 4, in Discussion section on page 11, and in Conclusion section on page 13**).

#2. It is a important topic but in core tip section, further elaboration is required.

**Answer)** As suggested, we have added such expressions to the core tip section (**page 4**).

#3. As mentioned correctly, further studies with clear standard protocols are required to draw clear conclusion.

**Answer)** As suggested, we have modified the concluding parts (**page 13**).

<To the Reviewer 2>

#1. The title and abstract cover outline the main aspects of the work, would it spark interest to the right audience. The original findings of this manuscript respect the concepts proposes.

**Answer)** According to the Cochrane handbook, we kept in mind the title of the present

study to be concise because it should briefly and comprehensively describe that the intervention and its problem are imaged. The present study followed the data obtained in an evidence-based manner.

#2. Relevance of the manuscript with the title and significance and potential impact manuscript to the right audience.

**Answer)** We have added this information in Article Highlights (**page 13-15**).

#3. This publication represent the clinical practice analysis for guidance the cardiac catheterization procedures.

**Answer)** As suggested, we have modified this information in the Introduction section (**page 5**) and the Discussion section (**page 11**).

<To the Editor>

#1. Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors reported a good meta-analysis, as quoted first systematic review. However, the conclusions must be drawn considering the strengths and weaknesses of the analysis of literature. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered.

**Answer)** We appreciate your suggestions. We reconsidered the strengths and weakness of our literature and have revised the parts of conclusion (**in Abstract section on page 4, in Discussion section on page 11, and in Conclusion section on page 13**).

#2. Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. 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.

**Answer)** We appreciate these helpful suggestions. We have added the figures using PowerPoint.

#3. Issue raised: (2) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

**Answer)** We appreciate your suggestions. We added the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text in article highlights (**page 13-14**).