

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 18202

**Title:** Mesh implants – An overview of crucial mesh parameters

**Reviewer's code:** 00468097

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-11 22:36

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-20 06:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very well done and illustrated easy this essay needs some clinical "real world" interjection. The issues related to hernia mesh and female incontinence and prolapse mesh should be included (abridged) for purposes of balance . Balance as defined by mechanical and technical issues. Technical errors of inception should be mentioned as critical to success or failure

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 18202

**Title:** Mesh implants – An overview of crucial mesh parameters

**Reviewer's code:** 00058573

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-11 22:36

**Date reviewed:** 2015-05-31 06:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nicely written. Covers all aspects.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 18202

**Title:** Mesh implants – An overview of crucial mesh parameters

**Reviewer's code:** 00071687

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-04-11 22:36

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-15 02:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

We have read with lot of interest the paper titled “Mesh Implants - An Overview on Crucial Mesh Parameters”, by Leiming Zhu et al. This paper aims to review the literature to identify all available information on the properties of synthetic mesh implants used for hernia repair. The authors evaluate crucial mesh parameters to choose the most appropriate mesh implant considering raw material and mesh composition, structure parameters and mechanical parameters. When reading the text, we can understand that the authors have an important knowledge of the different aspects related to the meshes in the human use, their qualities and strengths. The paper is well constructed and aims to give a clear guideline of different aspects related to all these meshes. The authors give a major role in the mechanical aspects and related biochemical compositions of the meshes which is accurate. On of the few considerations, related to the paper is to know if the authors should try to establish, if there are, a rational selection of the most appropriate device according to physicochemical properties of meshes. Can a mesh be better for elderly? For obese? For oncologic patients? We relieve that a final interest should be having a clinical classification for the mesh selection.