

Point-by-point responses

Manuscript No.: 65702

Journal name: **World Journal of Methodology**

Manuscript type: **Review**

Manuscript title: **History, anatomy and surgery for hernias involving the groin: comprehensive recognition of anatomy, classic considerations for herniorrhaphy, and current controversies in hernioplasty**

Corresponding author: **Tomohide Hori, PhD., MD., FACS.**

Invited Manuscript ID: **03475120**

Thank you for your valuable suggestions.

According to reviewers' comments, we revised our initial manuscript.

Please evaluate our revised manuscript.

We prepared **Marked revised manuscript** and **Clear version**.

In the marked version (Marked revised manuscript), additional mentions and deleted sentences are shown **in Red with or without strikethrough**.

Also, this summary of responses (**Point-by-point responses**) was separately made.

English language editing: The entirety of our manuscript has been fully checked by English language consultant. Manuscript (Main body, table and figures) has

been already checked by English consultant (edanz editing, Identification code: J2021-146776-Hori-Rev_a1).

To Reviewer #1

Thank you for your valuable suggestions.

According to your suggestions, we revised our initial manuscript as described below.

1. The Abstract section

‘This is a well structured review article. The authors thoroughly reviewed the history, anatomy and surgery for groin hernia. The figures clearly demonstrated the anatomy of the abdominal wall and anatomy of groin. There is a comment on this manuscript. Abstract section: The authors should correct the aim in the abstract section. It was written as "To present our data here along with a discussion of therapeutic strategies for fatal arterial hemorrhage after PD." which seem not to be related to this review.’

Thank you or your suggestion.

So sorry the irrelevant mention remained in the Abstract section in the initial manuscript. We adequately rewrote the Abstract section in the revised manuscript.

According to your suggestion, we revised, as ‘To summarize historical

turning points, anatomical recognition and surgical repairs.' (Page 3 line 4-6, in the Marked revised manuscript).

To Reviewer #2

Thank you for your valuable suggestions.

According to your suggestions, we revised our initial manuscript as described below.

1. CT image findings for diagnosis and complication

'Consider adding CT images of the described hernias and related complications.'

Thank you or your valuable suggestion.

According to your suggestion, we added a new figure (added Figure 5 in the revised manuscript) of CT and MRI image findings for diagnosis and complication (Page 55, in the Marked revised manuscript).

According to your suggestion, we added CT image for diagnosis, as 'Hence, the usefulness of computed tomography for diagnosis was suggested in 1983^[156]. Actual image findings are shown in **Figure 5A.**' (Page 17 line 11-12, in the Marked revised manuscript).

According to your suggestion, we added MRI image for postoperative complication, as 'Retroflexion of the uterus may cause female agenesis (**Figure**

5B).' (Page 25 line 13-14, in the Marked revised manuscript).