

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25679

Title: Current status of laparoscopic and robotic ventral mesh rectopexy for external and internal rectal prolapse

Reviewer's code: 00043099

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-21 18:46

Date reviewed: 2016-03-22 07:48

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

This is a good narrative review, but could have been methodologically stronger had a true systematic review been performed. The authors have highlighted many of the main controversies regarding indications, functional outcome, mesh type etc, but could have strengthened this section by alluding to the source of the concerns regarding mesh erosion, namely the FDA warnings on transvaginal mesh placement in 2011. There are other recent updated reviews that may be worth acknowledging, particularly with regards to the synthetic vs biologic debate (See Alam N et al Front Surg 2015). There are also other RCTs ongoing that should be mentioned, most notably the UK NIHR HTA funded CapaCITY 3 trial (<https://ukctg.nihr.ac.uk/trials/trial-details/trial-details?trialNumber=ISRCTN11747152>)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25679

Title: Current status of laparoscopic and robotic ventral mesh rectopexy for external and internal rectal prolapse

Reviewer's code: 00071727

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-21 18:46

Date reviewed: 2016-03-29 16:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read with interest your paper and I can state that it allows to expand the understanding knowledge in this controversial field. I think that some key-points should be elucidated: 1) the readers of your article will be on the one hand a useful update on the advantages and disadvantages of one approach over the other but on the other hand are not able to easily figure out how to choose for instance an abdominal approach compared to a transanal. To this it has been published an article by Festen et al (Controversy of symptomatic internal rectal prolapse: suspension or resection. Surg End, 2011; 25: 2000-2003). In this review it has been emphasized the role of an accurate workup in choosing the correct surgical approach. Thus, it should be noted that so far published studies do not always take into account this selection bias that obviously influences outcome. Also it must be said that many surgeons are often only a procedure (or abdominal or transanal route), irrespective of the clinical assessment. 2) The use of the robot is an alternative method to the laparoscopic approach. The authors should stress that the studies observed in the review do not offer a benefit greater than that; moreover, the costs are higher than laparoscopic. Overall, the use of Robot must take into account



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

this aspect.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 25679

Title: Current status of laparoscopic and robotic ventral mesh rectopexy for external and internal rectal prolapse

Reviewer's code: 00180872

Reviewer's country: Israel

Science editor: Ze-Mao Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-21 18:46

Date reviewed: 2016-03-29 19:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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

Current status of laparoscopic and robotic ventral mesh rectopexy for external and internal rectal prolapse Thank you for the opportunity of reviewing this paper This is a comprehensive review of the literature related to Ventral Rectopexy I have very few comments A description of the procedure should be considered Although the review does not aim at comparing the two techniques there is no intraoperative data. There are many abbreviations consider a table