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<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL COMMENTS</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This paper would benefit from review by a native English speaker to assist with the sentence construction and spelling. Abstract: Line 6, change ‘The’ to ‘This’ line 18, identify the date in April; change ‘literatures’ to ‘literature’ and line 19, change ‘studies’ to ‘study’. Line 25-random effect models may not always be used. Is it the journal guidance to have ‘dissemination’ as a heading-if not change to ‘conclusion’. Strength/limitation line 54, change ‘will’ to ‘may’ line 55-change ‘varies’ to ‘various’-also I am not sure what the authors mean here? page 3, line 4-change, rewrite to ‘subset analysis will be used to address the problem’. Introduction-could benefit from assistance by native English speaker. Page 4, the findings from the previous systematic review need to be added; and the next section needs to be rewritten to improve the ease of reading. Also numbers 0-11 should be written in the text. Page 4, line 41-seems to be some inconsistency here between the exclusion of cross over trials and page 8, line 17. Page 5, lines 32-45. It would appear that you plan to have multiple primary outcomes-I would have thought that some of these should move to secondary outcomes. Line 45, Please explain what ‘proceeding smoothly means’ Line 46-correct ‘trails’ to ‘trials’ Methods-do you plan to include grey literature? Might be useful to use Medline, and include the MeSH headings and an example of a Medline search strategy in the appendix. Can you clarify whether 2 people will complete the electronic searches? Page 8, line 15-change to ‘measured once the intervention is complete’. Line 24, change ‘literatures’ to ‘studies’ Line 30, change AKL to Akl. Page 9 line 22 change to ‘analysis to remove the impact...’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meta-analysis will be repeated and studies of lower quality will be excluded.

Is a discussion needed? The writing needs some revision by a native English speaker.

The authors have done a good job preparing this protocol and have described all the necessary steps to complete a robust review—apart from the lack of detail on the search strategy. I have corrected parts of the paper to improve the writing style—however all sections will need to be carefully checked and corrected.
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GENERAL COMMENTS
The paper presents the methodological issues of a meta-analyses the Authors are going to perform. Since acupuncture is much studied in China, the idea of running a meta-analysis that includes Chinese papers is appealing. Moreover, the description of the intended methods is correct and straightforward.
I recommend thorough linguistic correction.
I emphasize that the paper does not report the results of the meta-analysis, but only its intended methods. Acceptability for publication depends upon the Journal policy.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE
Reviewer: 1
Reviewer Name Prof Suzanne McDonough
Institution and Country University of Ulster
Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None
This paper would benefit from review by a native English speaker to assist with the sentence construction and spelling.
> The revised manuscript has been revised by two English-language speakers from Edanz Editing China.
Abstract: Line 6, change 'The' to 'This'
line 18, identify the date in April; change 'literatures' to 'literature' and line 19, change 'studies' to 'study'.
> We have changed the inappropriate words according to the reviewer's comments and identified the date.
Line 25-random effect models may not always be used.
> we have changed the ‘data will be combined with random effect model’ by ‘data will be combined with either the fixed or random effect model on the basis of the result of heterogeneity test’.
Is it the journal guidance to have ‘dissemination’ as a heading—if not change to ‘conclusion’.
> Yes, ‘dissemination’ is a part of structure in abstract according to the journal guidance.
Strength/limitation line 54, change 'will' to 'may'
line 55-change 'varies' to 'various'-also I am not sure what the authors mean here?
> We have changed the inappropriate words according to the reviewer's comments and revised the expression of limitation in line 55. We want to say the subgroup analysis will be done according to different acupuncture method and outcomes.
page 3, line 4-change, rewrite to 'subgroup analysis will be used to address the problem'. Introduction—could benefit from assistance by native English speaker.
we have changed the inappropriate words according to the reviewer’s comments, and submitted the revised manuscript revised by two English-language speakers.

Page 4, the findings from the previous systematic review need to be added;

We have added the conclusion from the previous systematic review in the introduction part. and the next section needs to be rewritten to improve the ease of reading. Also numbers 0-11 should be written in the text.

The manuscript has been revised by two native English speakers.

Page 4, line 41-seems to be some inconsistency here between the exclusion of cross over trials and page 8, line 17.

We have noticed this inconsistency and deleted the sentence 'For the cross-over trials, the first phase of the trial will be analyzed' in page8,line17.

Page 5, lines 32-45. It would appear that you plan to have multiple primary outcomes-I would have thought that some of these should move to secondary outcomes.

In the revised manuscript, we changed the primary outcome as ‘the primary outcome measurement is the proportion of patients with discomfort as assessed via completed questionnaire or visual analog scale (VAS), considering the discomfort may be described as throat discomfort, nausea, salivation and so on in different studies, so we planned to measure the proportion of different discomfort symptoms if the patient's condition permits.

Line 45, Please explain what 'proceeding smoothly' means

To avoid the misunderstanding, we deleted the sentence 'and the proportion of patients with gastroscope proceeding smoothly' and modified some words.

Line 46-correct 'trails' to 'trials'

We have changed the inappropriate word according to the reviewer’s comments.

Methods-do you plan to include grey literature?

Yes, we plan to include grey literature from the reference list of the previously published reviews and conference abstracts that may have on-going or unpublished trials in relation to both gastroscopy and acupuncture.

Might be useful to use Medline, and include the MeSH headings and an example of a Medline search strategy in the appendix.

We have changed the PUBMED by OVID MEDLINE in the revised manuscript and appended a search strategy at the end of the manuscript.

Can you clarify whether 2 people will complete the electronic searches?

The reason for 2 people completing the electronic searches is that we want to make sure the literature we searched is not missing for personal reasons, and make sure all the literature are included.

Page 8, line 15-change to 'measured once the intervention is complete'.

Line 24, change 'literatures' to 'studies'

Line 30, change AKL to Akl.

Page 9 line 22 change to 'analysis to remove the impact…'

Line 26 ' The meta-analysis will be repeated and studies of lower quality will be excluded'.

Is a discussion needed? The writing needs some revision by a native English speaker.

We have changed the inappropriate words according to the reviewer’s comment. The manuscript has been revised by two native English speakers.

The authors have done a good job preparing this protocol and have described all the necessary steps to complete a robust review-apart from the lack of detail on the search strategy. I have corrected parts of the paper to improve the writing style-however all sections will need to be carefully checked and corrected.
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Reviewer Name Marco GEMMA
Institution and Country S. Raffaele Hosp. - Milano - Italy
Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared
The paper presents the methodological issues of a meta-analyses the Authors are going to perform. Since acupuncture is much studied in China, the idea of running a meta-analysis that includes Chinese papers is appealing. Moreover, the description of the intended methods is correct and straightforward.
I recommend thorough linguistic correction.
I emphasize that the paper does not report the results of the meta-analysis, but only its intended methods. Acceptability for publication depends upon the Journal policy.

> Thank you very much. Our revised manuscript has been revised by an English editing service named Edanz Editing China.
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