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Reviewer's report:

The protocol is generally well written and covers most of the required information.

Major compulsory changes

I recommend the authors review their manuscript in light of the SPIRIT Checklist to identify gaps in reporting –

Minor compulsory changes

1. There are no details given relating to the surgeons delivering the interventions. Who will be eligible to participate and are there any restrictions? Will they deliver both or only one interventions? It appears to be the case that they will deliver both but the authors should clarify eligibility and delivery of the interventions.

2. In the surgical intervention section the authors should provide general details relating to the surgery which is occurring which is common to both groups as opposed to just focussing on the aspects which differ between the groups.

3. While some of the necessary randomisation details are given there is no information on how the allocation will be delivered and by whom. This should be added.

4. There are very few outcomes listed and they do not included common surgical measures. The authors should confirm the list is exhaustive and they will not be analysing other outcomes (e.g. common surgery related outcomes such as op time, length of stay etc.)?

5. It would be helpful if an explicit statement regarding blinding of participants, interventions deliverers, outcome assessors and whether it will be attempted. There is reference to one of the outcomes being blinded on page 10. Presumably there is no blinding apart from this, which is common in surgical trials.

6. How will participants be approached and consented? These details relating to the process are lacking and should be added.

7. There are no details about the process of data collection. How will the outcomes be collected and by whom. Adding a figure showing the outcomes by time points and mode of collection would be very helpful.

8. The ethics committee reference number should be added.
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