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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions
1. Abstract: Explain the abbreviations of “OR,” “CI,” and “WMD” at the first appearance.
2. Line 97: Was the “responsible author” the corresponding author?
3. Results section, characteristics of each study: Which type of gas tamponade was used? All the baseline retinal breaks in the MHRDs were only MHs? Were there cases with both MHs and peripheral breaks? Which type of dye was used for ILM peeling? Additionally, information on the follow-up duration after surgery is also important.
4. Line 176: “peeling1” should be “peeling.” Also explain the main result of meta-analysis including OR, 95% CI, and p value.
5. Figure 2: The positions of “Favours VT with ILMP” and “Favours VT without ILMP” are opposite in the forest plot.
6. Figure 3: The positions of “Favours VT with ILMP” and “Favours VT without ILMP” are opposite in the forest plot.
7. Figure 4: The positions of “Favours VT with ILMP” and “Favours VT without ILMP” are opposite in the forest plot.

Minor essential revisions
1. Line 54: need a space in “planavitrectomy.”
2. Line 113: “it” might be “if.”
3. Figure 1: “Studies include…” should be “studies included…”
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