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Reviewer's report:

It is unclear to this reviewer what the selection criteria for inclusion is.

In the methods it the following is stated:

"Inclusion criteria were (1) Participants: human with macular hole requiring surgical intervention; (2) Intervention: macular hole surgery; (3) Comparison: comparing FDP versus NSP ; (4) Outcomes: MH closure rate, best corrected visual acuity or more; (5) Methodological criterion: a prospective study, a case-control study or a cohort study.

Exclusion criteria were (1) Other differences between case group and control group beside the comparison of post-operative face position; (2) Insufficient data to estimate a odds risk (OR) or weighted mean difference (WMD); ..."

The largest published paper looking at this issue is Essex et al, 2016, Ophthalmology, which prospectively compared 628 eyes with no posture to 1806 eyes with face down positioning. This manuscript appears (to this reviewer) to fit the inclusion criteria. And yet the paper was not included nor referenced. I note the Essex paper was not a RCT, but nor were many of the included papers.

This I feel is a significant methodologic flaw, weakening the results and any conclusions drawn from them.

Alternatively the authors need to explain why this paper was not included.
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.

Unable to assess

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:
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