

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 20924

Title: Long term recurrence, pain and patient satisfaction after laparoscopic and open ventral hernia repair

Reviewer's code: 00477066

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-28 15:01

Date reviewed: 2015-09-01 22:35

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		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

This is an well-written clinical report dealing with the long term outcome of LVHR vs. OVHR. However Recurrence rate is higher than reported in current literature (is there any reason?). Furthermore this is a comparative study on a relatively small study population, so further studies are needed to give definitive conclusion. this concern should be highlighted and discussed in the revised manuscript.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 20924

Title: Long term recurrence, pain and patient satisfaction after laparoscopic and open ventral hernia repair

Reviewer's code: 02456643

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-28 15:01

Date reviewed: 2015-09-02 02:22

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 well presented observational study where the authors compare the laparoscopic with the open procedure in ventral hernia mesh repair and discuss long term outcome of these two methods with respect to recurrence, pain and satisfaction. In the method section the authors mention that "We enrolled 194 consecutive patients. 94 patients were treated with laparoscopic mesh repair and 89 patients with open mesh repair." The total of patients is 183. A few lines below they include 11 more patients in the open group conversions from laparoscopic surgery. This is not correct and is not in accordance with figure 1. Follow-up examination is not clearly defined, as the authors do not mention at what time after surgery the patients were examined. In the description of operative technique, in open repair the authors mention that often preperitoneal technique was used, they need to be more specific about what other technique was used and the number of patients. "Clinical recurrence and overall recurrence" must be defined. In the same section the authors mention Table 4, but this cannot be so as they cannot start counting with number 4. So this must be omitted or they must start counting from this table as table 1. Tables 5, 7 and 14 are not mentioned in the manuscript. Authors need to



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>

refer to tables in the manuscript in a proper order. Finally, the quality of the written English is lower than that expected for a scientific publication, so the manuscript requires a grammatical and linguistic revision.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 20924

Title: Long term recurrence, pain and patient satisfaction after laparoscopic and open ventral hernia repair

Reviewer's code: 02976835

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-28 15:01

Date reviewed: 2015-07-30 10:02

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 checked="" 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 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

This is an excellent clinical report dealing with the long term outcome of LVHR vs. OVHR. The work is extraordinarily impressive. Overall, the manuscript is thorough, straightforward, well-organized and almost contains all of the components the reader would expect. I would highly recommend the approval of its publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

ESPS manuscript NO: 20924

Title: Long term recurrence, pain and patient satisfaction after laparoscopic and open ventral hernia repair

Reviewer's code: 03036083

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-28 15:01

Date reviewed: 2015-08-22 19:10

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 checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input 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

This manuscript reports about the difference between LVHR and OVHR. It is well written and contains many valuable informations; however they should clear the following questions. 1. The recurrence rate differs in the operation method for OVHR; such as Kugel patch method and mesh plug method. So they should show the recurrence rate for each methods. 2. The recurrence rate in both OVHR and LVHR seems to be high compared to previous studies. What was the reason.