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**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory REVISION comments** | The authors need to clarify whether hospital stay refers to total length of hospitalization or to postoperative hospital stay. In the second case, they need to comment on the long for a laparoscopic procedure, postoperative hospital stay (49 pts stayed 4-6 days and 7 pts more than a week).  

33% of surgeries were performed on an emergency basis. What was the reason? Please clarify (acute inflammation?).  
I assume that all appendectomies were performed for acute appendicitis and all hernioplasties were elective surgeries for treating a hernia, but what about cholecystectomies? How many of these were emergency surgeries for acute cholecystitis and how many elective for cholelithiasis? Again the numbers do not fit and the presence of acute inflammation needs to be clarified. This is very important and might affect the rate of port site infection.  

The authors need to clarify what they mean by “port site contamination”. Did the gallbladder rupture during extraction from the abdominal cavity with subsequent bile leakage in the port site? Were these cases having an acute cholecystitis or simply cholelithiasis?  
The authors also need to mention whether retrieval bags were used for extraction of the specimen in cases of acute appendicitis and acute cholecystitis in order to avoid port site infection. |
| **Minor REVISION comments** | Sr. No (first cell in first column of Tables 1-3): Please clarify.  

Tables 1-6, are superfluous as the data are also given in the text and can be omitted. This also applies, although to a lesser degree to the rest of the tables and probably collapsing those into one comprehensive Table might be clearer. |
and more convenient for the readers.

Please clarify the sentence “Note: statistically significant at 5% level i.e., P<0.05 but not significant at 5% level i.e., p>0.05.” present at the end of the results section of the manuscript.

Optional/General comments

| Optional/General comments | Some language editing might be useful to avoid unnecessary repetitions and linguistic errors, and to improve clarity. |
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