Response to reviewers:

Question 1: Apply Prisma 2020 checklist and their statements in the methodology.

Answer 1: The checklist has been replaced by PRISMA 2020 version and stated in the methodology.

Question 2: Sentence starting on the line 78-79 was not clear to me. I suggest rewrite.

Answer 2: This sentence has been corrected.

Question 3: Line 99, I presume the word "cursed" was wrong. I correct word would be "curve".

Answer 3: This word has been corrected.

Question 4: Lines 159-160, the authors have included the results from the article of Shigefuku. The meta-analisys must have more than 1 article to analyse an effect size I think this sentence would be better placed in the discussion. The effect size "CSS" studied by the authors has only 1 article. So, I suggest to exclude CSS of the objective of the present study.

Answer 4: The CSS has been removed from the objective of this study and mentioned in the discussion part.

ABBREVIATIONS

All the abbreviations have been checked and corrected.

Response to Science editor:

Question 1: The manuscript is well-written and of scientific interest. Minor corrections are necessary in the english language writing, such as: on line 56 - "there are many more cases" instead of "there are much more cases"; on line 77 - "most of the studies included" instead of "most of the included studies". Other minor language corrections have been pointed out by the reviewer.

Answer 1: These errors have been corrected.

Question 2: Statistical analysis of the data is mostly correct, but we concur with the reviewer that cancer specific survival should be removed from the meta-analysis, as it was only assessed in a single study.

Answer 2: The CSS has been removed from the objective of this study and mentioned in the discussion part.

Question 3: While the introduction is comprehensive, there are only 23 references - authors should consider including more references for this section of the manuscript.

Answer 3: We have added several references in the introduction.