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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The quality of information provided is adequate and could be interesting for the researchers and stimulate further investigation.

Despite the statistical analysis is accurate, I have some concerns about the inclusion/exclusion criteria that should be cleared by the authors (conversely, the data analysis would not allow to a firm conclusion about the main questions of the study).
In particular, authors should declare whether they included women who underwent monolater/bilateral salpingectomy, tubal coagulation with/without cut, tubal ligation by stitches with/without cut? It is clear that these represent six different conditions and should not be evaluated in the same analysis (authors should perform *at least* a subanalysis).

In addition, authors did not declare whether their work followed the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Finally, it is not clear why authors did not register their work in PROSPERO database before to start the search.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

I hereby list the most important points to address:

- All the text needs a careful review by a English native speaker, in order to correct grammar and improve style.
- In the pdf I received for evaluation, line numbers were doubled (probably ones were added by authors before submission, the others were added by the submission system during the pdf creation).
- When citing other groups, authors should use "Surname et al. [x]" without the indication of the name of the first author (until it is not directly suggested by the guidelines for authors of the Journal).
- Introduction: authors should discuss, at least briefly, the current knowledge about the role of salpingectomy to decreased the risk of epithelial ovarian cancer. They may refer to: PMID: 30913193; PMID: 26513872.
- Methods: did author follow the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, beside the PRISMA? If the did not, they should explain why.
- Methods: inclusion/exclusion criteria are absolutely not clear. Did authors include women who underwent monolater/bilateral salpingectomy, tubal coagulation with/without cut, tubal ligation by stitches with/without cut? It is clear that these represent six different conditions and should not be evaluated in the same analysis (authors should perform *at least* a subanalysis).
- Methods: did author register the systematic review and meta-analysis on PROSPERO? If the did not, they should explain why.
- Discussion: authors should stress, at least briefly, the current management of endometrial cancers, especially in early stages in women of reproductive age, referring to: PMID: 28188573; PMID: 29544706; PMID: 28108938.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
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