

ANSWERING REVIEWERS



February 13, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 7474-review.doc).

Title: Transthoracic versus Transhiatal Surgery for Cancer of the Esophagogastric Junction: A Meta-Analysis

Author: Ming-Tian Wei, Yuan-Chuan Zhang, Xiang-Bing Deng, Ting-Han Yang, Ya-Zhou He, Zi-Qiang Wang

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7474

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers and main revisions were highlighted:

1 Format has been updated as following:

Abstract was formalized according to the author guidance;

Comments was added in the manuscript;

Decomposable figure was provided in the manuscript; furthermore, we would re-upload the five figures respectively;

Other minor revisions were highlighted.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer:

Reviewer 1 comments

The discussion part should be restructured for some passages. Here parts from the results section are just repeated without interpretation. The authors should focus on discussing their results in the context of the existing evidence. What are the pros and cons for either transthoracic or transhiatal approach. What are the differences between high and low volume studies, or between retro- and prospective analyses? Siewert did not invent three classifications, but one classifying three types of GE-junction cancer according to their position in relation to the anatomical cardia! Please correct throughout the manuscript. Discuss the limitations and drawbacks in more detail. This is the most important part of the discussion in order to judge the value of such an analysis. Further omit the statement that language difficulties may influence the results. This may not be an issue. If the authors lack English language skills in order to extract and understand the data, then a translator should be involved. English language has should be improved throughout the manuscript. It is strongly proposed to involve a native speaking person. Some passages are very hard to understand. Change numbers such as 1-15 to words (i.e. "3 studies..." should be changed to "Three studies..."). Reference number 7 does not fit the statement ("Stein et al. suggested...") Table 3: TH and TT most have been confused. It is assumed that "TT" means "transthoracic" and "TH" means "transhiatal". Please clarify. After addressing those issues recommendation for publication is strongly endorsed.

Response:

Thanks for helpful suggestions, we changed all the above mentioned points in the manuscript: 1) The discussion part was restructured, especially for pulmonary complication paragraph, repeated interpretation of results was omitted. 2) The expression for Siewert classification has been corrected. 3)

Limitations were detailed and the statement on language was omitted. 4) The manuscript has been revised by two native English speakers and the language has been improved. 5) Corresponding revision on numbers was done. 6) Sorry to confuse, reference number 7 was corrected. 7) Indeed, "TT" means "transthoracic" and "TH" means "transhiatal", and revision was done.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

The manuscript has been revised by two native English speakers and we believe that the language of the manuscript may reach the standard. Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Ming-Tian Wei,
Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery,
West China Hospital, Sichuan University,
No. 37 Guo Xue Alley, Chengdu 610041,
Sichuan Province, CHINA
Fax: +86 028 81654035
E-mail: m.weihx@gmail.com