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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This manuscript performed a meta-analysis. A meta-analysis was performed in this manuscript to reveal the role of MVD in differentiated thyroid carcinoma (DTC), and the conclusion is that MVD significantly correlates with the survival outcomes of patients with thyroid cancer. The results of this manuscript are meaningful. However, there are still some details to be revised: 1. Several abbreviations need explanation when they first appear, such as "FTCs", MTCs, "PTC". 2. The subtitle in the flow chart is not very clear. For example, "1626 studies excluded" is a subtitle, but not a paralleled list with "125 non human studies".
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
As you addressed in Discussion, this review has a critical weakness, i.e., low external validity. This review covered a small number of retrospective studies with a small number of participants. But the topic is very important and the review is truly meticulous. In this context, this review will be a great starting point in this direction.