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Reviewer's report
-----------------

- Major Compulsory Revisions

Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
1. No (there is no clear definition of primary and secondary outcome measures which renders further review of this paper pointless).
2. I am of the opinion that the subject matter is very relevant and deserve proper investigation.
3. I would recommend that the authors decided on a few important outcome measures: E.g. Objective measurements of circumference/volume & subjective patient comfort/pain/function and then re-evaluated the papers found in the literature search with that in mind. The literature analysis should focus on prospective blinded randomised comparative studies.

What next?
----------

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?

- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest
-----------------

BMC Cancer has a policy of publishing work deemed by peer reviewers to be a coherent and sound addition to scientific knowledge and to put less emphasis on interest levels, provided that the research constitutes a useful contribution to the field. If you choose one of the first three categories below, we may ask the authors if they would like the manuscript considered instead for the more selective journal BMC Medicine.