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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript by Sato et al. provides an interesting experience aimed at evaluating which intraoperative features can lead to inguinal hernia relapse after prosthetic surgical repair. Nowadays, despite the achievements in the field of minimally invasive and prosthetic surgery, relapse continue to represent a disappointing surgical failure in women receiving hernioplasty. In the last decades, we have identified several risk factors for recurrence related to patients' clinico-pathological features, but it remains poorly understood which surgical procedures could be useful in minimizing failure.

For these reasons, the presented paper appears interesting in term of originality and scientific relevance.

On the other hand, some criticisms have to be raised:

General points:

a) Manuscript title is not adequate and, it should be changed. Please, express directly what we are going to identify: the intraoperative features related to prosthetic failure of inguinal hernioplasty.

b) Methods should be improved: please clarify better the study nature in the methods, and abstract section.

c) Results section must be greatly improved. The readers need to have a quick overview of results that should be presented in a concise and clear approach. Please, improve this part of the paper.

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

Yes

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

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

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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