



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_22009
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A review of available experimental evidence on the use of prosthetic material in diaphragmatic hernia repair</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p>	<p><b>Title: change the title in order to write such as "in experimental studies" or similar.</b></p> <p><b>Abstract: Why only mentioned polypropylene....I think that the abstract could be more complete.</b></p> <p><b>Material an method: Describe the bias and blind analysis (if possible) in the selection, and Why two persons selected the articles and how is the discussion. What persons? Surgeons, research, residents....</b></p> <p><b>Table 1: I suggest inclusion of shrinkage.</b></p> <p><b>102: tackers are used? Not only sutures and fibrin glue. Cyanocrilates?</b></p> <p><b>107: Mesh shape: please analysed only the shape, not the complications. Are the complications in relation with the material (polypropylene is most dangerous material in contact with esophagus...so I think that the complication is not for the mesh shape, there are in relation with the material).</b></p> <p><b>128: please indicate the days. Month, time of recurrence ...</b></p> <p><b>145: percentage of shrinkage of PTFE?</b></p> <p><b>146: proceed is a composite mesh (cellulose and PPL).</b></p> <p><b>170: please, remark the problems in relation with the kind of material, not only remains an article of comparison PTFE-SIS.</b></p> <p><b>The PPL is the most important item in this point.</b></p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p><b>179: conclusions in results about the fixation, not only the studies. What is de most used? What seems the best? Global results of 28 studies?</b></p> <p><b>Results:</b> Should include the final results or a comparison of the final results of each article (only are 28 manuscripts) to shown a new table or a phrasal in every item analysed with the results. (For example, in shape: the articles results show: no differences. In the analysis of the shape (reflect in the table), the moda of the shape was U-shape i.e...And the best results were with the circular.....</p> <p><b>Discussion: I accord with the problems of the analysis of literature, the quality of the studies. One solution could be making a new scale of quality or used one of the most used (in evidence). In order to offer some results in comparison with the studies.</b></p> <p><b>Tables:</b> Are very complete and I like all them. God Job!</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Juan Manuel Suárez Grau
Department, University & Country	Hospital General De Riotinto, Huelva, Spain