

Review Comments

Thank you very much for your valuable comments from the evaluation experts. These professional guidance make my articles more concise and logical and more fluent. I have made corresponding changes to the above problems.

For Reviewer 06135116:

Comment 1: The authors should modify title carried out term of "systematic review and meta-analysis".

Reply 1: This paper is based on the gene expression level in GEO and TCGA online databases, which belongs to bioinformatics analysis. It's not a systematic review or meta-analysis. We changed the title of the article to express the core of the article more clearly.

Changes in the text: Modified title: MMP14 is a diagnostic gene of intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma associated with immune cell infiltration.

Comment 2: What is the future perspective of this review? How and what the other researcher will address regarding your findings in future, after synthesizing your results, you'd better mention that in the conclusion.

Reply 2: To solve this problem, we have added related discussions in Research perspectives, which are modified as follows: Based on bioinformatics analysis and machine learning algorithm, MMP14 was identified as the characteristic gene of ICC and was associated with ICC immune cell infiltration. In the future research, it will be of great significance to explore the signal pathway mediated by MMP14 in the occurrence and development of ICC and the mechanism of immune cell infiltration.

For Reviewer 06143358:

Comment 1: In title, there is no suggestion to meta-analysis, please revise it to be more informative. - Core tip is missing.

Reply 1: This question has been answered in the first comment of reviewer 06135116.

Comment 2: The Discussion section makes a lot of repetitive descriptions of the background introduction. Please delete this section and streamline the discussion of knowledge that we all know.

Reply 2: We have trimmed the repetition of the background in the discussion and adjusted for the rest.

Changes in the text: See the text discussion section.

Comment 3: Please discuss about restrictions of relevant previous meta-analysis studies.

Reply 3: This paper is a bioanalysis, not a meta-analysis. The limitations of bioanalysis have been mentioned in the discussion.

Changes in the text: The original text has not been modified.

Comment 4: Figure 9 requires adding a magnification

Reply 4: We have improved the clarity of Figure 9.