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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revision

The authors have compared Laparoscopic versus open wedge resection on the basis of 156 patients. No sample size calculation was performed. Only univariable analysis was performed and there is also the problem of multiple significance testing. The authors should acknowledge all these limitations and draw their conclusions with caution. Firm conclusions cannot be drawn from this study given the limitations. It is not possible to determine whether the statistically non significant P-values, particularly the ones that are less than or equal to 0.2 are due to lack of power. This is really an exploratory analysis.

The authors should present the confidence intervals in Table 3.

Were there any missing values?

In the meta-analysis since all included studies were observational studies, did any of the included studies adjust for confounders. If so were there different confounding variables considered across studies and how did the authors deal with these differences?

The 95% CI for operative time in page 9 is extremely wide. The authors should comment on that.

Some of the meta-analysis results show more than 80% heterogeneity. These studies may be too heterogeneous and it may not make sense to pool them. The authors should discuss this issue.

Discretionary

I don't see the point of presenting P-values when comparing patient characteristics. The results can just be presented in tables for descriptive comparisons without the P-values.

Essential Minor

The Kaplan Meir curve is not showing much. There are hardly any events. The authors should consider presenting median times with intervals.

P-values below <0.001, for example 0.000 should be presented as P<0.001.
The authors should label the funnel plot on the basis of the meta-analysis it represents, since several were conducted.
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