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Reviewer’s report:

I thank the authors for submitting this manuscript which I enjoyed reading and which contains some interesting data. The manuscript is generally written in a clear and informative manner. I have some comments to help improve it.

I think edema should use the British spelling of Oedema in this journal.

ABSTRACT:
This was nicely written and clear. I have two points for clarity here:
10 studies were included, 3 with control, but it isn't clear as written if the "all but two" equates to 8 or 1, i.e. "all but two of n=?). The 2nd last sentence reads slightly clumsily - suggest revise.

BACKGROUND:
This is written in a very clear, concise and logical manner. It summarises the rationale for the current study well. It would be worth briefly summarising the findings of previous studies that have examined the topic, to clarify the gap in knowledge being addressed, and so the reader gets a feel for what has been published and the trends, either homogenous or heterogenous, in the literature so far. The sentence at L 155-7 (No previous SR…") could perhaps move to here, or be duplicated here, to clarify the gap in knowledge.

METHODS:
Again this is very clear and logical overall. Search strategy - please clarify why you only searched back to Jan 2000.
I also suggest re-running the searches as the end-point, of June 2018, is now over a year ago. L 130-131: I am not quite sure on the meaning of "reported as some (mean) circumferences…". What does "some" mean - perhaps reword for the reader.

RESULTS
This looks fine.

DISCUSSION
To help the reader, I suggest start this section with a clearer summary of the main findings. Currently it starts with a broader discussion of the area. Para 2 - it would be worth making it clear here that in this para you are discussing only the 3 studies with an active comparator. Similarly I found that it was a bit difficult to draw out the detail of what was written. A more in-depth discussion here of the findings from the analysis would help the reader. For example, clarify why/where you found "no clear treatment effect".
Para 3 starting L 210 - is this para about MF surgery? Please clarify. I also suggest finishing this with a summary of your findings for that area.
Para 4 starting L 222 - same point - is this para about your findings on extremity surgery? I think so but it needs to be clearer.

Overall, this was a very nice paper but it would help to add some clarity in the Discussion. When trying to understand or make inferences from it, I could see there were some papers with positive findings, but overall no strong evidence of effect, however I found it difficult to extract a clear summary/synthesis of why there was a gap between the two aspects. I do understand why, but felt this could be clearer for the reader.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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