

Authors' Response to Reviewer Comments

Thank you for your email regarding our manuscript. We now submit a revised version which takes into account the comments of all the reviewers. In response to the specific issues raised:

Reviewer (1) This study is very interesting. In this study, the authors introduced a novel modified primary closure technique in LELAPE for low rectal cancer, and evaluated the feasibility, safety and cost-effectiveness compared with biological mesh closure technique. The study is well designed and the results are excellent. Only some minor language revisions are required.

Answer: Thanks for your comments. Minor language revisions have been performed as required.

Reviewer (2) Interesting study. I have no comments.

Answer: Thanks for your comments.

Reviewer (3) Very interesting and useful technique. No special comments.

Answer: Thanks for your comments.

Reviewer (4) In traditional APR, the pelvic peritoneum is usually closed prior to reconstruction of the pelvic floor, in order to separate the small intestine from the presacral operating field. The authors modified the primary closure technique by adding the procedure of laparoscopic pelvic peritoneum suture, and applied it to LELAPE. In this study, the authors compared this method with biological mesh closure in the reconstruction of the pelvic floor after LELAPE, and evaluated its feasibility, safety and cost-effectiveness. 1 The study is very interesting, and the new findings of this study is that the modified primary closure method for reconstruction of the pelvic floor in LELAPE for low rectal cancer is technically feasible, safe and cost-effective. 2

The methods are described in adequate detail, and the results are well displayed. 3 The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. 4 Tthe manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately. The discussion accurate and it discuss the relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. 5 Figures and tables are excellents.

Answer: Thanks for your comments.

We wish to thank all the reviewers for their constructive comments, and are grateful for the opportunity to improve the manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Yanlei Wang and Professor Yong Dai
on behalf of the co-authors