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Reviewer’s report:

General
I thought this was an interesting and well written paper which is worth publishing. My only comment is that I was surprised that it was rarely necessary to extend the incision into the thigh. I use the open technique and find that it is usually necessary to use thigh vein. It would be useful if the authors could comment on this in the discussion with reference to any differences in wound healing and whether or not the knee area is avoided as there are so many more branches in this area.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
My only comment is that I was surprised that it was rarely necessary to extend the incision into the thigh. I use the open technique and find that it is usually necessary to use thigh vein. It would be useful if the authors could comment on this in the discussion with reference to any differences in wound healing and whether or not the knee area is avoided as there are so many more branches in this area.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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