

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63434

Title: Outcomes and Complications of Open, Laparoscopic, and Hybrid Giant Ventral Hernia Repair

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04123907

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-03 01:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-03 04:38

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="radio"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="radio"/> Minor revision <input type="radio"/> Major revision <input type="radio"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- From Sentence 229 to 231, some numbers are in discord with the abstract. Please correct it. And explain why the hybrid procedure are low intestinal injury compared to the open surgery. I think that open IPOM procedure seems to be almost the same to the hybrid procedure. “ The rates of intraoperative intestinal injury were 6.1%, 4.1%, and 15% (1.5% ???) in the open, laparoscopic, and 15 hybrid groups, respectively (hybrid vs. open and laparoscopic procedures; $P<0.05$).” -From Sentence 241 to 242, the lowest incidence of operative site infections seems to be at the open group but not the laparoscopic group considering your data. Please check it out and correct. -Why did the open surgery group have a longer length of hospital stay compared to the hybrid group? Please mention it at the discussion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 63434

Title: Outcomes and Complications of Open, Laparoscopic, and Hybrid Giant Ventral Hernia Repair

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03822338

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MNAMS, MS

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-01 20:16

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-20 03:06

Review time: 18 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. There are issues of certain basic issues in the hybrid procedure which the authors have described. There are lots of custom modifications that the authors have made. Even the open procedure is not clearly mentioned. 2. There are certain grammatical mistakes and some poor formation of sentences At the present state the article is not fit to be accepted. Either there have to be major modifications along with clarification that have to be made, but certain like the operative procedure cannot be corrected. So my opinion is to REJECT the article.