Reviewer's report

Title: The use of autologous fascia lata graft in the laparoscopic reinforcement of large hiatal defect: initial observations of the surgical technique

Version: 2 Date: 13 December 2014

Reviewer: Andras Vereczkei

Reviewer's report:

The question addressed in the paper represents a currently discussed problem of hiatal closure. Authors define this adequately. The title accurately covers the topic. Background is sufficiently discussed. The surgical method is clear and well described. However, the problem of fascia lata fixation could possibly be discussed in the discussion part, as the solid surface of the graft – compared to mesh structure - may cause difficulties. Result data are sound, however, in the 1st table hernia surface area is abbreviated as HAS, which should be corrected to HSA. Patient numbers in the follow up periods are illogical, as more patients are in the 12 months than in the 6 months group. Logically everybody controlled at 12 months, was checked also at 6 months. Either this should be corrected, or the tag should be changed (only at 6 months).

The language is acceptable, however there are minor errors like (103 dissection-dissected, 138 retroesophageal, 145 the-there, 152 swallowing -swallowing, 153 feel – feels, 157 defect – defects, 170 there – they, 201 patient – patients, 214 feel – feels). Thus spelling and grammar should be rechecked.

The figures are of good quality, appropriate for publication. However, the authors are writing about U shaped graft form, which cannot be recognized on the second figure. This should be corrected.

The manuscript otherwise adheres to current standards for medical publications. Discussion and conclusions are well balanced and supported by their data.

Limitation of the study is described in one sentence, which though may be enough as this is a pilot series report.

In the reference list, the 5th citation, which is a basis of the whole paper, is incorrect. The proper one should be replaced.


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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