BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

Name of Journal: ***World Journal of Meta-Analysis***

ESPS Manuscript NO: 23482

Manuscript Type: SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

23482 – Answering reviewers

I thank both reviewers for the time they spent considering our paper.

We are glad that Reviewer 00608206 was happy with publication of our paper. No specific points that needed attention were raised.

We are disappointed that Reviewer 00608185 felt "the finding was not interesting and informative for readers" especially, as Reviewer 00608206 put it, it questions the commonly held assertion that there is a weak link between passive smoking and lung cancer, arguing that most, if not all, of the association can be explained by confounding and smoking misclassification.

Reviewer 00608185 had two specific points. The first was that the methods section was too long. As regards this we have now substantially reduced the methods section, and moved much of the detail to a new Supplementary file. We have also reread the rest of the text of the paper also, and have made a number of changes to somewhat shorten that also.

Reviewer 00608185 also complained that "this is not a mathematical but a scientific journal". Inasmuch as the paper is a meta-analysis, it of necessity uses some mathematics/statistics to derive its results, and we felt that in some parts of the methods it is necessary to explain the methods clearly using equations. However,

we have reduced the number of equations, which now form only a very small part of the new methods section.

The full extent of the changes made to the paper can be seen in the file 23482-Revised manuscript_Comparison.docx that has been provided to the journal with the revised manuscript. The number of changes is large, many related to keeping to the journal's requirements for the revision, and many related to shortening the paper. However, the results are completely unchanged, and the message from the paper is unaltered in substance. Some points to note are given below.

There are now no Appendices and 4 rather than 2 Supplementary Files.

Instead of giving study details partly in Table 1 and partly in Appendix 1, they are all now in Tables 1 and 2, with the old Tables 2-6 renumbered as Tables 3-7.

What was in Appendix 2 (details of rejected studies) is now in Supplementary File 3.

Supplementary File 1 is new and gives fuller details of methods.

Supplementary File 2 is unchanged.

Supplementary File 4 is what was previously Supplementary File 2.