

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_115778
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Botox prior to abdominal wall reconstruction - A local experience in a tertiary hospital in Singapore
Type of the Article	Case report

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
--	---------------------------	---

Review Form 1.7

<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describing the situation and use of botox prior to abdominal wall reconstruction is of value. The main value of the paper is in the literature review of previously published technique, dosage, time interval, etc. 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract is appropriate. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. There are a few inaccuracies in the reporting of injection and surgical technique that I would recommend clarifying prior to publication. I have included them along with a few grammatical suggestions below. 6. The references are generally sufficient. Hoffmann, Henry^{1,2}; Nowakowski, Debora^{1,2}; Kirchhoff, Philipp^{1,2}. Chemical abdominal wall release using botulinum toxin A: A personal view. International Journal of Abdominal Wall and Hernia Surgery 5(1):p 30-35, Jan-Mar 2022. DOI: 10.4103/ijawhs.ijawhs_46_21 would make a valuable addition. In addition, it could be mentioned that there are two randomized controlled trials of botulinum toxin A vs placebo that are ongoing. <p>Additional Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. CS should be defined in the abstract prior to its' use, i.e. the end of the last sentence in the. Introduction should read "...techniques like component separation (CS)." 8. The first sentence in the third paragraph calls the technique "chemical compartment separation". Should this read "chemical component separation?" 9. The paper cites the possible reason for the lack of uptake of chemical component separation as due to a "significant variation in dosage, concentration, and anatomical landmarks, as well as the optimal duration of administration prior to surgery". A summarization of the different options available in the literature with associated outcomes (perhaps as a table with a row for each paper and a column for each of those categories as well as the study outcomes) would add greatly to the value of the paper. 10. In the first paragraph of the case summary, the phrase "sealed anastomotic leak" could be confusing. Rephrasing this as "contained leak at the anastomosis" or "contained anastomotic leak" would be more consistent with the description of this type of leak in the literature. 11. It is not tremendously pertinent to the underlying purpose of the paper, but as you are describing all of the other factors that contributed to the hernia formation, it may be worthwhile to include the method and suture material of fascial closure. 12. In the first sentence of the technique section "elected" and "choose" are synonyms. I would recommend using one or the other. I.e. "Our interventionist elected to use the technique..." or "Our interventionist chose the technique..." 13. In that same sentence, what is an interventionist? I am not familiar with this term. Is that the same as an interventional radiologist? 14. In the description of the technique, the concentration and/or total volume of fluid used should be reported. Was this similar to a botox injection of the anal sphincter in which a small volume of concentrated botox was injected or more similar to a transversus abdominis plane block in which a large volume of dilute lidocaine is injected? The picture is very helpful, but includes an 'x' at the anterior superior iliac spine which is of unclear significance. In addition, the description says the injections were given at the anterior axillary line but the picture depicts two injections at the anterior axillary line and one at the midaxillary line. The picture and description should match. Furthermore, the description says the injections were given in the aponeurosis, but there is not aponeurosis this lateral, there is fascia for each muscle layer and it is not possible to inject within the fascial plane, but just above or below it. If the picture is a correct depiction, then I would recommend describing it as follows: "300 IU of BTA in ___ mL of saline per side was distributed at three sites bilaterally along the anterior and mid axillary line as depicted below. At each site an equal volume was injected just deep to the external oblique, internal oblique, and transversus abdominus fascia." 	
---	--	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>15. In the second paragraph of technique, it says “the anterior rectus sheath was divided lateral to the lines semilunaris...”. The lines semilunaris is the lateral border of the rectus sheath, there is no rectus sheath to be divided lateral to this. Did this mean to say “the external oblique aponeurosis was divided just lateral to the linea semilunaris from the costal margin to the level of the anterior superior iliac spine to complete an anterior component separation.”</p> <p>16. The postoperative CT appears to demonstrate that the posterior rectus sheath was closed as well although this is not described. Was this performed? If so, please include it in the description of the procedure.</p> <p>17. Was a mesh left in place? For a hernia of that size, the standard of care would be mesh placement, if so, please describe placement of the mesh including fixation, mesh size, and mesh type. if no mesh was used, please describe why. It is also unusual to use an absorbable suture for a hernia repair with component separation. Consider explaining the suture choice.</p> <p>18. The paper reports that an abdominal binder was used to avoid wound complications, however I am not aware of any literature that demonstrates a decrease in wound complications from abdominal binder use. It has, however, been shown to improve pain control.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the language is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Christopher Vetter</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>United States</p>