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**Reviewer's report:**

**MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS**

1. Referring to "Materials and Methods", I think it isn’t correct to say that any selection bias is eliminated because the choice of surgical approach was made by surgeons a priori and not according to the characteristics of the patients. It is more correct to say that the bias on the choice of treatment is minimized, as you say in the "Discussion".

**MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS**

2. At the beginning of "Material and Methods" "We performed a retrospective review of the charts" is repeated twice.

3. In the "Results", I would say "Regarding intraoperative complications, a bladder lesion was detected in the open group" instead of "Regarding the intraoperative complications was detected a bladder lesion in a patient group open".

**DICRETIONARY REVISIONS**

4. In "Materials and Methods", there isn't a description of open appendectomy technique (type of incision...).

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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