Reviewer's report

Title: From digital world to real life: a robotic approach to the esophagogastric junction with a 3D printed model

Version: 1 Date: 22 Aug 2019

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:
Although the paper is very well written, it fails to convey what the benefit of the 3D printing versus conventional imaging was. The authors should clarify the advantages.
REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Here are my comments:

Please highlight how the 3D changed the conduct of the operation.

In methods, please elaborate more on how the 3D model was studied preoperatively by the surgical team and what critical decisions were made based on the model available.

Please mention the cost of the 3D model created in the text.

It would be good to label the critical structures in figure 1.

Although the text is nicely written, the benefits of the 3D model have not been visually conveyed to the reader. The figures are insufficient and unattractive in their current format. They need to be labeled and the quality enhanced. They should also show the axial conventional imaging used in the figures. They should especially show the coronal images and place it side by side with the 3D model. They should very sincerely highlight what additional information the 3D model provided compared to conventional imaging. In its current format, they report creation of the 3D model for an esophageal case, but the benefits have not been highlighted. Also, although the language of the text is good, it could be enhanced by having it reviewed by a native speaker. There are some sections where the tense has been used incorrectly as listed below.

Line 64, replace "even if" with "even though"
Line 91, replace "remains" with "remained"
Line 95, replace "has been" with "was"
Line 110, replace "can" with "could"

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
Please see my comments above

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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