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Reviewer's report:

Review of:
'Optimal functional outcome measures for assessing treatment for Dupuytren's Disease: a systematic review and recommendations for future practice'

Strengths: The study is well written. Each measurement tool is described well, as are the strengths and weaknesses of each measurement tool for use with DD. A bigger strength, of course, is that this study clearly indicates the heterogeneity of measurement tools used across studies and the ensuing difficult that this is for clinicians trying to determine which surgical technique should be utilized.

Major Compulsory Revisions
The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

1. None noted.

Minor Essential Revisions
The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

1. The authors need to fix the odd symbols present in the Supplemental Table 1. Although they define that $ indicates truncation, it is distracting. Since this is a supplemental table, reducing the truncation will lead to a more informative table.

Discretionary Revisions

1. When I began, I though that the limited number of collagenase injection studies included (n=9) compared to surgery automatically places the former at a large disadvantage (i.e. the studies of the 3 surgical choices that were included in the review lack balance). Although the aims are met and the discussion explains the challenges of this study well, is there any way an adjustment could be made in their inclusion strategy that would balance the systematic review better? This adjustment may also expand the number of needle fasciotomy studies included. That said, the results as well as the discussion already address the challenges of this study. Therefore, this is a discretionary suggestion.
Review by Mary F Barbe

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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