Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Point 1: Abstract: Poorly written. You can state your second key finding about gender in the abstract rather just a qualitative statement. You can also state in your abstract the details on alphabetic vs logographic language.

Response: With the help of a native English speaker, we have rewritten the abstract section, and highlighted our findings about gender and language types (Page 1, Lines 32-37).

Point 2: Last line in the abstract references to low-income countries but no analysis was referred to about this in your results or discussion. What does low-income countries and area mean? Though limited by operational definition for dyslexia used in many studies the gender difference being significant but language differences not being significant can be phrased into your conclusion as a main clinical take away message.

Response: We appreciate this thoughtful comment. Previous studies [1-2] have suggested that socioeconomic status may affect the prevalence of dyslexia. We thus divided countries into low-, middle- and high- income levels according to the standards of the World Bank. However, the studies included in the current meta-analysis study were conducted only in countries at the high- and middle-income levels. This prevents us to reach a full conclusion regarding the effects of the socioeconomic status, rather we suggest that future studies on DD need to be conducted in the countries and areas at low-income level (Page 15, Lines 388-393). The reviewer is right that effects of gender and language types are important. We have highlighted them in both abstract and conclusion (Page 1, Lines 40-41 in the abstract and Page 15, Lines 397-400 in the conclusion).

Point 3: Line 92, as well as in the abstract: From “inception” – please give the best start date/year you have. Looks like around 1970.

Response: This comment is well taken. The start date was 1950s. We have clarified it in the revised manuscript (Line 27 in Page 1 and Line 108 in Page 3).

Point 4: Define primary school students - ages and grade.

Response: We have added the definition of primary school students (age range: 6-13 years; and grade range: 1st-6th) (Page 3, Line 119).

Point 5: Line 123 – were they the same two researchers that conducted the literature review?

Response: We are sorry for the confusion. They were not the two researchers of the literature review. Their names are X.L. and M.Z. (the third and fourth authors) respectively, and the two authors for data extraction are Q.A. and Y.Z. (the fifth and sixth authors). We have clarified it in the revised manuscript.

Point 6: Why was "some population from another included study" (N=12) excluded? If it was a different, study, authors, location they should be included.

Response: These studies were conducted by the same authors in the same location-(N=12) and from the same dataset, but the way of result presentation and the sample size were different. Therefore, our current review only included those reporting the most comprehensive results or with the largest sample size. We have clarified this more clearly in the revised manuscript (Page 3, Lines 124-126).

Point 7: Other category - 6 were excluded. Other is not a suitable word to described or characterize in this flow chart. What was the reason for exclusion - clearly state.

Response: This is because of lack of sufficient data for sample information. We have added the reason for exclusion in the revised manuscript (Page 3, Line 134).

Point 8: Line 168 – your flow chart above says 56 studies were selected, but the denominator here is 58. Needs to be fixed. Lines 169 and - Both sentences are accounting for an incorrect number and both for alphabetic. The latter is for logographic. The table is mostly reflecting 58 studies but you had only 56 studies selected - Table s2 and Table s3.

Response: We are sorry for this confusion. The present review finally included a set of 56 articles with 58 studies, because two articles (Lindgren et al., 1970; Jiménez et al., 2011) contains two studies respectively. We have clarified this more clearly in the revised manuscript (Page 5, Line 183, Figure 2, Figure S3 and Table S3 (in which the two studies contained in the same article were distinguished by labeling Study 1 and Study 2).

Point 9: Line 206 – 209 is not clear. Rephrase.

Response: We have revised these sentences (Page 10, Lines 237-239).

Point 10: In the results you do not provide the findings for grade but have a paragraph on it in the discussion.

Response: Thank you for pointing out it. We have added the results for grade in the results section (Page 10, Lines 243-246).

Reference

1. Peterson, R.L.; Pennington, B.F. Developmental dyslexia. *ANNU. REV. CLIN. PSYCHO.* **2015**, *11*, 283-307.
2. MacDonald Wer, B.M. Comparison of reading development across socioeconomic status in the United States. PhD Thesis, Univ. Denver, CO, **2014**.