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Reviewer’s report:

Dear Sir,

The authors have revised the manuscript, and made clear improvements, but not really addressed the multiple questions raised by my previous review. The three cases are interesting, and focus on a significant problem, which has perhaps become more prevalent due to the success of modern critical care, keeping patients alive that would have previously succumb.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. There is no Methods section nor a hypothesis in the body of the paper, though the abstract does present a Methods. Is there a hypothesis, or is this paper intended to be a series of case reports? The Background and Discussion sections still read more like a narrative review article.

Minor essential revisions:

1. I am still curious why the authors used the particular mesh (Parietene Composite), and what tissues were immediately below the mesh (omentum, bowel, etc.).

2. The manuscript still contains contentious, unreferenced statements. The initial sentence in the Abstract and also the Background section of the paper is such an example.

3. The manuscript would benefit from professional revision of the language. Many non-standard terms, and mistakes in grammar, remain.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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