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Reviewer’s report:

I appreciated this study which is interesting and well written; however I have some questions/remarks:

- Indication to NPWT or mBVP was based on the preference of the surgeon and on the availability on the device. Can you detail this? Use of one system or the other was most based on surgeons' choice or on availability? I remark that mBVP group is represented by 18 patients whereas NPWT by 65. Do you explain this difference with surgeon preference or availability?

- You say that mBVP was used in the first period of the experience. May you present the results according to the time frame? Maybe the time frame is significant predictors of overall mortality.

- Can you better define overall mortality? (30 days, 90 days..)

- Please detail the causes of death: I remark that no significant differences were noted concerning in hospital mortality. However overall mortality was higher in the mBVP group. A total of 8 patients died "not in-hospital". May you better explain these data? How and where did they die?

- It is important to report results of multivariate analysis in a Table.

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.

Yes

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:
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