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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
  1. How was the programme implemented in the 12 centres?
  2. How was the protocol supervised in each centre?
  3. Did protocol compliance vary between centres? Did this relate to length of stay at each centre?
  4. 64% of procedures were performed laparoscopically and yet median length of stay was 6 days. Did laparoscopic surgery (minimal access) contribute to the rate of recovery of patients? If not, what value is there in the laparoscopic approach?
  5. What was the extent of missing data? How was this handled?
  6. The discussion should include the views of the authors on what were the difficulties of implementation, how they overcame them, and what they consider they still have to achieve.
  7. What was the length of stay in the 12 centres before the programme was introduce?

- Minor Essential Revisions
  1. The abstract should contain a statement on length of stay.
  2. The protocol should be clarified. Was it really the case that patients undergoing a right hemicolectomy received pre-op enemas?

- Discretionary Revisions
  These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.
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