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Review statement:

The author addresses the problem of the surgical physiology of the inguinal hernia repair. He states the importance of the posterior wall of the inguinal channel and its dynamic physiology. He describes his personal experience in 200 of 560 inguinal hernia cases and concludes the advantage of his technique of hernia repair.

Considered issues as requested;

1) Shortcomings of this paper are mainly concerning the method used in this study. All intraoperative findings are made by individual estimation, without any attempt to achieve objective data. The problem of tension of the musculo-aponeurotic layer has been investigated and measured using a new developed device by Peiper et al. in 1998 (Peiper C, Junge K, Futing A, Conze, Basaley P, Schumpelick V. Intraoperative measurement of suture forces in shouldice repair of primary hernias. Chirurg 1998;69(19);1077E81).

2) There are no serious flaws to preclude publication. The concept of the „authors technique” is not enough specified or explained.

3) There are no data presented concerning the outcome, follow-up or recurrence rate using the „author's technique” for inguinal hernia repair. From the description available

4) The manuscript adhere to the relevant standard of reporting, beside the lack of any statistic analysis(see 1. objective data).
5) The title and abstract are adequate.

6) The writing is acceptable.

Compulsory revisions:

The technique used by the author should be more described in detail. The follow up and exact results concerning post-operative complications and recurrence rate should be mentioned when describing the advantage of a „new method”.

Since all investigated parameters are collected by subjective means, without any possibility for objectivation, a replication of this study seems difficult.
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