



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMMR_14911
Title of the Manuscript:	Polypropylene Mesh for Recurrent Incisional Hernia: Different Operative Techniques
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are many papers in the literature comparing repair types for incisional hernia. This paper includes very very few number of cases. No prospective comparative design. No randomization. A conclusion from such a paper would not be reliable for the readers of the journal	I agree few as a start, in the near future the number will be considered We compare different techniques. I agree no randomization in the technique but random cases The conclusion would advice the reader to the type of technique. Many thanks
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		