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Reviewer's report:

1. In the Outcomes of Meta-analysis section, you have confirmed the publication bias for MH sizes smaller than 400 μm. Please also mention and explain this in the Discussion section.

2. From lines 114 to 115, "Afterwards, the the remaining potentially relevant reports were assessed for eligibility by the full text based on inclusion and exclusion criteria described below." Please delete the duplicate word 'the'.

3. The posturing period and the type of gas used are all different in the five studies included in the analysis. C3F8 gas was used in most of the studies, but Guillaubey et al. used SF6 in MHs of small size below 500um and C2F6 or C3F8 in MH of size larger than 500um. What are your thoughts on the possibility of different outcomes depending on the type of gas used?

4. Also, when analyzing the effect of face down position on MH of less than 400um, Guillaubey et al. maintained face down for 5 days for 8 hours and Zhang et al. for 16 hours for 3 days. In addition, Zhang et al. used the inverted ILM flap technique when performing MH of more than 400um. Therefore, when performing the meta-analysis, patients with a MH of &gt; 400 μm will be blended with patients with conventional ILM peeling and those with inverted ILM flap technique. Each of these studies has different types of gases, different pruning times, and different surgical techniques. These points might have affected the results.

Page 7, Line 159 : 19 did not included did not include

Ref. 8, 20, 21, 27, 33 : The references listed here do not follow the guideline suggested. Please check the format.

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