

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-20-854>

Review Comments

This is a very interesting article with regard to potential efficacy of Raman Spectroscopy in the diagnosis of Esophageal Cancer. Nevertheless, minor revisions could improve article's quality.

Reply: Thank you for your comments concerning our manuscript entitled “The Efficacy of Raman Spectroscopy in the Diagnosis of Esophageal Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis”. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper’s quality, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction point to point which we hope meet with approval.

1. In the Introduction section the number of paragraphs should be reduced.

Reply1: We carefully read the introduction and found that all the content was what we wanted to convey to the readers, it is difficult to delete the sentence. So we combined the second and third paragraphs of the introduction into one paragraph to reduce the number of paragraphs in the introduction section. If you think that it is necessary to delete some sentences when you review it again, we will delete some sentences reasonably according to your opinion.

Changes in the text: See page 4 line 83.

2. In the Results sections try not to repeat information included in Tables and Figures.

Reply2: Thank you for your comments, your suggestion made the paper more concise.

We re-read the result and deleted some information which could get from Tables and Figures.

Changes in the text: See page 6 line 148.

3. In the Discussion section 3rd and 4th paragraph should be written as one paragraph.

Reply3: We have combined the 3rd and 4th paragraph of the discussion into one paragraph.

Changes in the text: See page 10 line 256.

4. Conclusion should be more concise.

Reply4: Thanks for your careful comments, according to you advise we have made the conclusion section concise.

Changes in the text: See page 2 line 38 and page 11 line 307

5. Newly published manuscripts should be included.

Reply5: Thanks for your advice, we re-searched the databases and we didn't find other related newly published manuscripts.

6. Tables are excellent.

Reply6: Thank you very much.

7. The number of Figures should be reduced.

Reply7: We deleted PLR and NLR in Figure 3 and Figure 4, the information of the 4 pictures were described in the result section.

Changes in the text: See Figure3 and Figure 4.

8. Grammatical errors should be corrected throughout the Text.

Reply8: Thanks a lot for your careful comment, we tried our best to carefully check the entire manuscript and corrected all the grammatical and other potential errors.