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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: None

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Important topic.
Biologic prosthesis is usually used as a single-stage repair that treats the infection and repairs the abdominal wall defect during the same procedure. The authors proposed to perform a delayed primary closure of contaminated abdominal wall defects using biologic graft.
I have the following remarks to make:
- To be consistent with current scientific evidence, the use of bioprostheses in grade III remains controversial since the use of synthetic implants in such cases has shown no increased risk of infection or gastrointestinal fistula (Souza JM, Surgery. 2013 Mar;153(3):393-9). I think you may want to change your
introduction to reflect this fact.

- Grade III and IV cases were combined (as in RICH study) and the results were not analyzed according to hernia grade sub-groups. This is the main problem with this study.

- I think you are mistaken when you say the presence of enterocutaneous fistula, mesh infection or intestinal perforation is a contaminated field. This is an infected field (grade 4) and is much different. Which recurrences were in true Grade 3 and which were in Grade 4?

- P9, I don’t understand what is the interest of the sentence about the 88-year-old patient. Please, explain or delete.

- p14, “Selection process and outcome” section: Too long and duplication should be avoided.
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