



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 55178

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing skin closure with tissue adhesives vs. subcuticular suture after robotic urogynecologic procedures

Reviewer's code: 00506495

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Israel

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-09

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-12 09:56

Reviewer performed review: 2020-08-12 10:55

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The fact that it took during the trial in average less than half the time to close the wounds with the tissue adhesive and more than 50% for the closure with the sutures, as compared to your surgical experience with these two methods (as disclosed in the Methods Section), is somewhat surprising and raises the possibility of unmindful bias during the trial towards the use of the tissue adhesives. Please discuss the significant differences from your previous clinical experience to the current results and of the above-mentioned potential bias.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 55178

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing skin closure with tissue adhesives vs. subcuticular suture after robotic urogynecologic procedures

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FRCS (Gen Surg), MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-09

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-18 10:35

Reviewer performed review: 2020-08-18 11:19

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting study that is well designed, well carried out and in a healthcare system that is driven by financial implications has an important message. The saving of approximately 20minutes per case by using tissue adhesives might have significant implications in the American system but in the UK for example the cost of the tissue adhesive over and above the cost of sutures will bizarrely carry more weight (only people who have worked in the NHS will understand but not agree with this approach). This study is a RCT in an area where there are few and as such provides a useful addition to the literature in this area.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 55178

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing skin closure with tissue adhesives vs. subcuticular suture after robotic urogynecologic procedures

Reviewer's code: 02510721

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-09

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-13 14:53

Reviewer performed review: 2020-08-20 09:26

Review time: 6 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To Authors The study shows the results of the comparison of two procedures for the skin closure in urogynecological robotic surgeries. The Methods are correct for this basic study, even if the number of cases is low. The data to be evaluated are appropriate. The Results are believable and the statistical analysis is accurate. The Discussion is well developed, analyzing the various features of the safety and aesthetic results of the two methods of the skin closure. Ultimately I have only one observation: In the discussion could be useful to add some considerations of the site of the skin suture regarding the uneven distribution of elastic fibers in normal human skin, which can affect the aesthetic results of skin closure. The References are up-to-date, but the numbering of components is necessary. The Tables are clear and appropriate.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Methodology

Manuscript NO: 55178

Title: Randomized clinical trial comparing skin closure with tissue adhesives vs. subcuticular suture after robotic urogynecologic procedures

Reviewer's code: 00053888

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FRCS (Gen Surg), MD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-09

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-10-10 07:15

Reviewer performed review: 2020-10-10 09:41

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**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

This is an interesting and useful study in an area where there has been little RCT evidence.
The authors are to be congratulated and the manuscript is worthy of publication.