Dr. Jiang and colleagues provided a meta-analysis based on trial sequential analysis to evaluated association between genetic polymorphism of several coagulation-related genes and venous thromboembolism. The study was performed rigorously and the findings are interesting. Although there are still lots of problems, it was worth to be published to provide the quantitative evaluation for the relationship if the authors could make the following changes.

1, Since there have been already several meta-analyses to this problem, the current study is only the update and comprehensive analysis to the previous study, the present manuscript should be change to ‘brief report’ and the manuscript should be as short as possible. Keep the most important Figure and Table in the main-manuscript and remove Figures and Tables which might not be so important to the supplementary and be sure don’t put overlapped table and figure at the same time, such as Table 1 and Figure 2. As the background section, please shorten it to two paragraphs. Remove all the non-related contents in background and discussion, for example, “*the human EPCR gene is located on chromosome 20 at position q11.2. It spans approximately 8 kb and contains 4 exons”, these kind of information is not related to the study at all.* Actually, it is a quite traditional meta-TSA analysis, therefore, it is quite easy for the read to get the messages from the manuscript. Don’t make it too complicated and redundant which would decrease the citation.

2. In current study, the authors provided all the analysis based on different genetic models, such as dominate model, genotype based analysis, recessive model and so on. However, As the reality biology, maybe on only one kind of model are truth, how to deal with this problem? Another question is why select these 5 different models, why not including additive model?

3, Please provide exact Review Manager 5.3 input as the supplementary so that the readers could check the result and make the manuscript more reproducible

4, Reference are strongly redundant and disordered, such as the reference 27 in page 6, line 5, do you think the reference is right? Please check all the reference and remove the mistake reference.

5, Polymorphism and mutation are quite difference, I recommend the authors use polymorphism rather than mutation in current manuscript.