

Response to reviewer 1:

Question 1: It is a good comment, but I could not understand the subject very well.

Answer 1: SMI is a nutritional index calculated through the CT images and we demonstrated that it is a novel and valuable prognostic indicator in lung cancer and might contribute to the clinical management and treatment of lung cancer patients.

Response to reviewer 2:

Question 1: This meta-analysis was performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA 2020) checklist. However, PRISMA 2009 checklist was attached in the Appendix.

Answer 1: The PRISMA 2020 checklist has been updated and uploaded.

Question 2: In the section of "Literature retrieval", authors mentioned that "the PubMed, Web of Science and EMBASE electronic databases were searched up to November 5, 2021." However, what was the inception date for the search?

Answer 2: The inception date "database establishment date" has been added. (page 3, line 19)

Question 3: Were keywords and MeSH terms both used in literature retrieval?

Answer 3: Actually, the keywords and MeSH terms were both used in the literature retrieval, which has been updated in the manuscript. (page 3, line 19-20)

Question 4: In "Figure 1. The flow diagram of this meta-analysis", authors don't need to show reasons for "n=0" for the excluded studies.

Answer 4: This has been modified.

Question 5: Figure 2 is not the funnel plot. Instead, it is a forest plot.

Answer 5: So sorry for this mistake and we have corrected the title of figure 2.

Question 6: Please list potential reasons for the heterogeneity in meta-analysis as shown in Figure 2.

Answer 6: The potential reasons for the heterogeneity have been listed in the results part. (page 5, line 11-12)

Question 7: I cannot find the registration information on page 4 according to the attached PRISMA checklist.

Answer 7: This information has been added (page 3, line 16). However, it would take few months to obtain the registration number.

Response to Science editor:

Question: This manuscript is a meta-analysis exploring the prognostic value of computed tomography-derived skeletal muscle mass index in lung cancer. Please supplement the start date of the literature search and list potential reasons for heterogeneity in the meta-analysis.

Answer: These issues have been addressed in the manuscript.

Response to 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 Clinical Cases, 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.

Answer: These issues have been addressed in the manuscript.**7 STEPS FOR SUBMITTING THE REVISED**