

Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for your attention and the referee's evaluation and comments on our paper **Association between esophageal cancer risk and EPHX1 polymorphisms: a meta-analysis**. We have revised the manuscript according to your kind advices and referee's detailed suggestions. Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 5610-edited.doc). We sincerely hope this manuscript will be finally acceptable to be published on *World Journal of Gastroenterology*. Thank you very much for all your help and looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards

Sincerely yours

**Title:** Association between esophageal cancer risk and EPHX1 polymorphisms: A meta-analysis

**Author:** Qin-Tao Li, Wei Kang, Man Wang, Jun Yang, Yang Zuo, Wei Zhang, Dan-Ke Su

**Name of Journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 5610

1 The manuscript has been improved by the AmEditor, and it supplied the certificate.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewers

(1) Referee 00004678

Comment: Please state in the discussion that results from Adenocarcinoma and Sqaumous cell carcinoma were pooled and discuss whether this has any impact on the results.

Response: Thanks for the referee's kind suggestion. Because the progression of esophageal adenocarcinoma and sqaumous cell carcinoma are reflected histological by the metaplasia-dysplasia-carcinoma sequence. The recent identification of molecular markers provides insight into the molecular pathogenesis of EC different subtypes, and there is no diverse between them. The revised details can be found in paragraph 2 of "*Discussion*".

(2) Referee 00001114

Comment: Please introduce other genetic polymorphisms to predict developing esophageal cancer.

Response: Thanks for the referee's kind advice. We added this point in revised manuscript and the detailed revision can be found in paragraph 3 of "*Discussion*".

(3) Referee 02460000

Comment1. Please provide a flowchart for literature research.

Response: Thanks for the referee's kind suggestion. According to his/her advices, the

flowchart of this meta-analysis was given in Supporting Information (Figure 1) in this revised version. It illustrated that we have added in our paper.

Comment2. The authors say in the inclusion criteria “(iii) the paper should clearly describe the sources of cases and controls.” I wonder what they did with the articles that did not clearly describe the source of cases and controls.

Response: Thanks for the referee’s good proposal. We excluded the paper that did not clearly describe the source of cases and controls.

Comment3. The authors say “population-based (PB) case-control study was defined as controls from healthy people.” In many population-based studies, all controls may not be healthy. These controls are selected from the general population and not from hospitals and clinics, and this is the difference between these two groups of controls.

Response: Thanks for the referee’s good evaluation and kind suggestion. The referee’s explanation is very correct. We agreed with the suggestion and have modified it in our paper.

Comment4. Please also add a paragraph on the association between polymorphisms in this gene and risk of a few other cancers reported in other meta-analyses.

Response: The referee’s explanation is very correct. According to his/her advices, we have added a paragraph on the association between polymorphisms in this gene and risk of a few other cancers reported in other meta-analyses. Thank you!

(4) Referee 02471371

Comment1. From a formal point of view, a few sentences could be improved in a few sentences by a slight proof-reading.

Response: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing. And we have improved some sentences according to the review’s suggestion.

Comment2. The nomenclature used for describing the polymorphisms is far too approximate, which is not a problem limited to the present study only, but which could be easily corrected.

Response: Thanks for the referee’s good proposal. We are very sorry for our negligence of using standard nomenclature. Considering the referee’s suggestion, we have modified the words.

Comment3. Redundancies could be avoided in the discussion.

Response: Thanks for the referee’s good evaluation and kind suggestion. We have re-written the paragraphs in the discussion to the referee’s suggestion.

Comment4. The discussion is interesting, but whenever possible, arguments would be strengthened by citations of previous and/or comparable studies.

Response: Thanks for the referee’s good proposal. We have referred to other comparable studies and amended the corresponding places.

4 References and typesetting were corrected

We are so sorry that we send these revised files back at this time. We deeply hope that we have the chance to correct our error and the kindly chance to publish our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Thank you for your hard working behind. We appreciate all of the editors and reviewers.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Dan-Ke Su

Department of Radiology,

Oncology Hospital, Guangxi Medical University,

71 Hedi Road, Nanning 530021,

Guangxi Province, China.

Telephone: +86-771-5334950 Fax: +86-771-5334950

E-mail: sudanke@hotmail.com