University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust

Clifford Bridge Road,

Coventry

CV2 2DX

United Kingdom

15 November 2015

Editorial Team

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery

To Whom It May Concern:

Please find detailed below a structured response to reviewer's comments regarding the submission entitled:

"An overview of robotic colorectal surgery: Current and future practical developments"

Manuscript number: 19058.

Reviewer's comments	Response
"ROLARR results have been published and should be included"	ROLARR results had not been made public at the time of original publication and their subsequent publication has been included in this submission.
"One of the advantages of the Robot system upon conventional lap is the computer between the surgeon and the patients. Please address this concept with relation to current status and future options."	The advantages of the robot as an intermediary have been discussed, with particular reference to motion scaling and tremor reduction.
"Some figures and illustrations will make it more appealing to the reader"	Figures have now been included.
"The manuscript appears to be an overview rather than a review"	The title has been modified to reflect this.
The authors present a review of current and future uses of the robot. I have several comments: - The article seems to focus on current limitations of the robot, rather than an in-depth review of current uses. The major focus is on a preview of future developments. I would suggest changing the title accordingly (e.g. "Current limitations and preview of future developments"	
"The authors report that there are improved sexual function and decreased morbidity with robotic prostatectomy. This has not been shown in every study (Hu JC et al. JAMA 2009;302(14):157)"	This content has been included.
There seems to be a lot of jumping around that occurs in the first few pages of the manuscript.	There have been some changes to the structure of the article to reflect this criticism. We have

I think this would be better served by less text and a comparative table showing the studies discussed / referenced and the major findings, # of patients, type of study, etc.	chosen to discuss articles within the main text of the article rather than within a table to allow consideration of the studies within the context of the article itself, rather than presenting a simple list of findings. We aim to provide an overview of study findings, rather than a critical appraisal of articles and their findings.
"At several points, the authors focus on lap vs. open, and it seems this is beyond the scope of the paper, as it is a study of current and future uses of the robot."	A consideration of the merits of laparoscopic surgery over open surgery is important when considering the place of robotic assistance in the future of surgery. Without laparoscopic surgery it is unlikely that robotic surgery would have its current position and investment.
"The section on capsule endoscopy in the second half of the manuscript should be combined with the section on robotic endoscopy."	The section has been repositioned
"The conclusion should add a sentence that the robot may allow the benefits if minimally invasive surgery to a wider range of technically challenging situations."	Conclusion has been edited.

All changes have been highlighted within the text of the submission. If you have any further queries we would be happy to revisit these with you.

Sudipta Roy

Charles Evans