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Reviewer’s report:

the presented series is one of the largest experience of temporary abdominal closure techniques. however, the main problem is the research question of the study? what did the authors aim?

if a comparison between two techniques is aimed, it makes sound, however, with the presented methodology (extreme heterogenous groups, no randomisation, no sample size analysis, etc), having a conclusion such as NPWT has better outcomes compared to mBVP, has no scientific sound. this can not be a conclusion, just a interpretation of the authors.

the other way, if the authors aimed to present their experience, you do not need such a good methodology and it is possible to present your conclusion based on your aim (not any superiority or non-inferiority conclusion). and you do not need to present tables included data of both groups.

briefly, i recommend to revise the methodology and research question as appropriate..
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