



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u><a href="#">British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</a></u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJMMR_22009</b>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> ( <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> )
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>This is a good scientific work but with a generic content. It may be published because it may represent a starting point for further study more specific about the subject. Alternating use between the terms diaphragmatic and hiatal hernia can confuse the reader. I believe the authors should talk only of hiatal hernia (see "Type of study").</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<b>Authors might add a final table that summarizes the advantages and disadvantages identified for each prosthetic device, providing the reader with a final summary.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Pasquale Cianci</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Foggia, Italy</b>