

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Surgical Procedures

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 14310

**Title:** Surgical Management of Rectal Prolapse: The Role of Robotic Surgery

**Reviewer code:** 00043099

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-09-29 21:54

**Date reviewed:** 2014-10-30 19:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Existing	<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"/> [ ] No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Many thanks for asking me to review this narrative review of robotic surgery for rectal prolapse. It is very well written and gives a concise overview of the topic and of the limitations with the literature. One minor drawback, which I do not believe should inhibit the manuscripts publication, is the omission of 2 papers published over the past month or so: Rondelli F et al, Int J Surg Oct 2014 Mehmood RK et al, Int J Colorect Dis Sep 2014 The authors may wish to expand their comments on outcome reporting. For example, they have, like most other authors, focused on recurrence and "safety" (I assume they mean perioperative complication rates) rather than patient focused outcome measures such as quality of life, anorectal and / or sexual function. Only one study reported functional data (as they have noted) which is rather disappointing. This reflects the current published data rather than any oversight of the authors of this manuscript, but I can't help but feel the authors have missed the opportunity to highlight the glaringly obvious gap in the available data. Overall this is a very good paper and I enjoyed reading it. The English language style is superb.