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Reviewer’s report:

Interesting article comparing FLACS with CPE using the available literature. In general well written and good statistical analysis and good figures. I am not really certain, why some of the papers were excluded (see below):

- Please distinguish between different levels of studies (randomised controlled vs, cohort, vs retrospective...), furthermore, how often was the comparison bilateral?

- Eight studies out of 544 were included. Of these there are basically only two large studies (Abell and Ewe) all the other studies had a significantly lower number of patients included. Therefore, it would be relevant to present all data together (as it is currently shown in the manuscript), but also to compare complication rates between the selected 8 manuscripts in more detail.

- p. 5: 6 studies were excluded because they did not report "relevant complications". Please specify, didn't they report any complications, or were they not relevant? If not relevant, please explain, why the authors do not consider the mentioned complications as relevant.

- p. 6: 30 studies were excluded, because they were "duplicated studies". What does that mean?

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

Yes

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

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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
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