

Dear Editor and reviewer

Thank you for considering our manuscript for publication in the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery. We were pleased to receive the reviewer and editorial comments and would like to respond to them as follows

Reviewer 1

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. Overall, it is review of 24 articles about different procedures and outcomes of transperineal repair of rectocele. It is an interesting issue because symptomatic rectocele adversely affects a woman's quality of life, with symptoms of obstructive defecation, straining, constipation and/or faecal incontinence. Transperineal rectocele repair offers an effective method of symptom improvement. Long-term outcome data for all approaches are sparse and heterogeneous where they do exist. Objective quality of life data are needed. The paper is well structured and written, and has up to date references.

Thank you for the favorable appraisal of our manuscript.

ASSESSMENT

Up to 93% of healthy, asymptomatic women are found on defecating proctography to have radiological evidence of a rectocele. The indication for surgical treatment is predominantly based on symptoms and not radiological evidence of an anatomical rectocele. This issue has to be shown clearer in the text.

Thank you for this comment, we added a statement implying that treatment should be based on symptoms and not just on radiologic evidence of rectocele. (Page 5)

MANAGEMENT

Indications for abdominal approaches are lacking.

The indications for abdominal approaches of rectocele repair were added.(Page 6)

STRATEGY OF LITERATURE SEARCH

Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be shown clearer.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria were shown clearer as suggested. (Page 7)

CONCLUSIONS

A discussion section should be interesting, including FDA concerns regarding (transvaginal) mesh repair in general that cannot be ignored, citing complications including erosion and fistulation that were not rare.

We added to the discussion the concerns regarding transvaginal mesh repair and its complications.(Page 13)

Limitations of the review (heterogeneity of data..) are lacking.

We added a section entailing the study limitations. (Page 13)

Few grammatical and syntax errors should be corrected.

The English language of the manuscript was revised as suggested.

Science Editor

(1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor

The original figures were provided as PowerPoint slides to ensure that all graphs and arrows or text portions can be reprocessed.

(2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout

The references were revised throughout according to this comment.

(3) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text

We added the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

(4) The authors need to download and fill out the STROBE checklist with page numbers;

The STROBE checklist was filled and uploaded.

(5) Please upload to the system the PDF version of a statement affirming that the statistical review of the study was performed by a biomedical statistician.

A statement about the statistical review of the study was provided