

## 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

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

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

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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](mailto: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

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

To Authors The study shows the results of the comparison of two procedures for the skin closure in urugynecological robotic surgeries. The Methods are correct for thie basic study, even if the nimber of cases is low. The data to be evaluated are appropriate. The Results are believable and the statistical analysis is accurate. The Discussioni s well developed, analyzing the various features of the safety and aesthetic results of the two methods of the skin closure. Ultimately I have only on 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

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

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.