

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2766
Title of the Manuscript:	The Current status of Open inguinal hernia repair in Adults: Narrative Review
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I do like this manuscript as it sounds good in the era of laparoscopic and robotic surgery. After the introduction of laporo-endoscopic procedures most of the abdominal surgeries are shifted toward these approach of minimal invasive surgeries(MIS). While the surgeries for the groin hernia are being done by traditional open technics in many centres especially in developing countries. The open technics are the treatment of choice for complicated hernias. The resident surgeons must know open technics before learning the MIS procedures for groin hernias. The most worried complications for the patients and as well as for the surgeon following hernia surgery are recurrence and chronic inguinodynia. These complication rate were same for both open and laporo-endoscopic procedures.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is acceptable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	My syggestion are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mention about the need of learning the importance of open procedures even though they are older techniques.</li> <li>• The inguinal hernia patients are to be catergerised like unilateral, bilateral, sex, elderly age group, recurrent hernias, complicated hernias...</li> </ul>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	ADD SUBSECTIONS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Treatment options for recurrent hernia, compliacated hernia.</li> <li>2. Comparision studies of each open techniques with laporoscopic surgery procedure.</li> </ol>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Considering the importance of knowing about open techniques for inguinal hernia in this era of laproscopic / robotic surgery, i do accept this manuscript sounds good. <p><b>SUGGESTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Needs to write more about the steps of each open procedure steps (considering the audience as resident surgeons).</li> <li>✓ Needs to catergerise the hernia patients. The choice of hernia surgery procedure is subject based and individualised.</li> <li>✓ Include more Comparision studies with laporoscopic surgery. Most of the studies mentioned here are comparision among the open techniques. As the title is mentioned as current status, author should tell more about pros or cons with laporoscopic surgery.</li> <li>✓ In conclusion part also it is written as change in trend within open surgery techniques. Now a days surgery for inguinal hernia are open meshplasty or laporoscopic (TEPP or TAP). The choice among these depends on patient condition, type of hernia, financial support..., i.e., choice is subject specific. European Hernia Society guidelines and The HerniaSurge guidelines also mentioned the same.(9&amp;10).</li> </ul> <p><b>CONTRADICTIONARY STATEMENTS: (bold and underlined line with yellow highlighted sentences)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All open inguinal hernia proceduces are also cost effective and are associated with <b><u>reduced</u></b></li> </ol>	

[Review Form2](#)

	<p><b>stay in the hospital.</b> Correction is that the laporoscopic procedures have shorter duration of hospital stay. Some time the open procedure do have same duration about 3-7 days of hospital stay (6).</p> <p>2. the mesh and non-mesh-based repairs <b>are the best and most effective surgical approaches.</b> Correction, there is no single best or effective approach in hernia repair.(10)Choice of surgery is subject specific.</p> <p>3. <b>Table 1</b> is written in the manuscript but it is nowhere mentioned in the discussion.</p> <p>4. <b>Manuscripts has no pictures or tables</b></p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p><b>NEED MORE REFERENCES TO mention about the comparision with current surgical approaches i.e., laporoscopic procedures.</b></p> <p><b>It is better to mention about the Sources of references.</b></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Minor grammatical errors, spellings are highlighted with yellow colour.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u>comments</p>	<p>_____</p>	

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ramalingeshwara Kantly
Department, University & Country	RGUHS, India