Comments to the Authors,

This manuscript conducted a meta-analysis to evaluate the efficacy and safety of Lixisenatide for Inadequately Controlled Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. The findings are interesting. However, I still have several major concerns.

1, In the abstract section, the author claimed “random effects model was used in order to give a more conservative estimate of the efficacy and safety.” Why random effect model could provide conservative estimation? Does it represent random effect model should be applied in all the meta-analysis, so that the estimation is more conservative?

2, In the method section about ethical approval, it is common sense that ethical approval is not requirement. Please remove it.

3, The study should be updated since it has been long time since the deadline of May 2015.

4, In the method section of Statistical Analysis, how to remove the studies with obvious heterogeneity should be described explicitly since there will be many ways to do it. In addition, too much arbitrary study selection strategy was applied which would affect the conclusion of the meta-analysis. I recommend to use sensitive analysis and remove the study one-by-one or two-by-two to check the stability of the conclusion.

5, In the section of Risk of Bias, the author used ‘in the forest plots below’, it is hard to understand which figure the author want to mention since the current version are not well-format. Even after the publication of the paper, the figure might not the under current paragraph. I hope authors could check such kind of way throughout the manuscript.

6, Table S1 is including too much important result of the manuscript, it cannot be considered as Supplementary table, it must be put in the main-body while the figure of the risk-of-bias actually could be taken as supplementary since it is only quality control not the result.

7, lots of typo and gram errors. Such as Line 127, ‘was’ should be changed to ‘were’.