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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and clinically relevant review about uterine compression sutures, the materials used and the thickness of the sutures.

Here are my comments about this article:

The conclusion of the review is overestimated. There is no significant difference between the No 1 and 2 groups considering all suture materials. However the authors conclude at the end of the text "UCSs with size 2 sutures seem to achieve better uterine preservation than with size 1 sutures." The authors must emphasise that the significant results belong only to 2 suture materials, Polyglactin 910 and catgut.

There are many kind of compression sutures and their modifications, such as B-Lynch, Cho, modified B-Lynch etc. How do the authors standardise the success rates of those different methods?

How do the authors interpret the success rates, if some of the patients got also additional arterial ligation?

86.9% and 93.5% are quite near to each other. Considering that many different physicians with various experience levels were included in this review, do the authors find these close rates clinically significant, just not thinking about statistics for a second?

It is not an excuse for me "not being able to differentiate the indications due to low number of patients" if the authors make such strong conclusions, which seem to include all types of indications. One may not evaluate every single indication but the authors may at least make a subgroup for uterine fundus atony and give the success rates. Otherwise, comparing the accreta cases with fundus atony does not seem to be appropriate.

The difference between the success rates of Polyglactin 910 (which is used very often in Europe) No 1 and 2 is very striking (56.7% vs 90.2%). I think the authors may emphasise this difference, for sure, better by giving the success rates in the uterus atony subgroups.
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