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Reviewer's report:

General
Dear Editor

Many thanks for allowing to review this article. I would like to congratulate for author's their hard work. However I would like to raise some questions and concerns regarding the paper.

1- I would like raise the question to authors regarding what exactly the difference of their technique than already well known techniques such as Hanley procedure. My question is what exactly new in this report?. They did a very nice review of the literature, however I cannot find significant difference or new as a technique or the principle of the procedure they applied to their patients

2- Also they emphasized the fact that, no complications were seen. I sincerely believe in them, however we need some objective measures such incontinence scores and quality of life measurements that are commonly used in any functional or complication outcome study after anorectal procedures to be able to make a clear statement of any technique this assertively.

3- I also wonder why authors elected to do US, MRI or fistulography? Could they comment on this?

4- They said in the conclusion section they also said usage of a seton and if I have read correctly they made a point of unroofing the fistula tracts.

5- Do the authors follow-up their patients weekly? This is a very frequent follow-up period for most of the centers. Can they comment on the necessity of this on a retrospective study?

^- I enjoyed reading this article, however I wonder whether BMC is the right forum for this type of pure clinical article. I wonder whether they may have a better chance with above revisions in another journal.

Many thanks for allowing me to review this journal

FEZA H.REMZI

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Minor Compulsory Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Advice on publication: Reject because too small an advance
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