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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors reviewed all steps to practice safe laparoscopy surgery. The review is well written. So I would suggest it is published in WJSE.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear Authors, congratulations on this narrative review on safety considerations in laparoscopic surgery. I have read it with great interest. I believe your manuscript is perfectly clear in the way it is written and structured and it suits surgeons who are starting laparoscopy or who want to have a clear comprehensive overview of it. However, I believe it needs some minor corrections, as annotated in the uploaded file, to be perfect. I would also introduce a paragraph regarding the general use of indocyanine green (ICG) during laparoscopic surgery. This has great use in laparoscopic surgery where the eyes become the surgeon's main hands because of the absence of haptic feedback. I would add it especially because it can be effective as a safety procedure for several surgeries (HPB, colorectal, visceral..). Because of the high quality of this review, I would also add a comment on new surgical equipment which are for example the articulated laparoscopic instruments of ArtiSential. This technology was developed to introduce robotic-like instruments in laparoscopy. I believe this can have a strong future development in teams that don't have the availability of a robotic platform. There is some literature on this new technology that can be added if you believe it could add value to your review. Please read the comments aside from your manuscript in the uploaded revised paper as it could better help to revise it. Congratulations on your manuscript.
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It has been a nice study that defines what people who will undergo laparoscopic surgery should do. The language of the article is very good (A). The algorithmic presentation of the subject is very well planned. I had a few suggestions for the article. My suggestions can be seen in the text. References are current and sufficient (117? Rules?). It can be accepted with minor revision.
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Comments  The author expounds on the safety considerations of laparoscopic surgery before, during, and after operation. The content is comprehensive and detailed, which has a certain guiding significance for clinical practice. After careful revision, I agreed to publish it. Minor revision: 1. The Keywords are inaccurate or cannot reflect the focus of the manuscript. It is suggested to delete "General surgery" and add "Laparoscopic surgery" and keywords related to "safety considerations". 2. In the section "Laparoscopy setup", it is recommended to add the relationship between surgeon ergonomics and patient surgical safety. 3. The author does not describe "antibiotic prophylaxis and patient allergies" in the article, which is not consistent with the conclusion. 4. The part of "Conclusion" should be simplified. For example, "Women in the childbearing age group should be offered a routine urine pregnancy check at preassessment, and surgeons should also have an advanced discussion with patients and family on the options available when faced with hostile or unexpected intraabdominal situations." should be moved to the "Patient selection" section. 5. There are some syntactic ambiguities: i) "This was not helped by adverse events seen with laparoscopic surgery such as visceral injuries and complications from pneumoperitoneum[7,8].", the meaning of this sentence is ambiguous in the context. ii) "Where feasible, we suggest endoscopic procedures relevant to surgery and tattooing to facilitate intraoperative identification of pathology [21,22]. Though not routine, some patients may benefit from mechanical bowel preparation to facilitate intraoperative localisation of pathology[23].", the meaning of this sentence is ambiguous in the context. iii) "Laparoscopic surgery can be physically and mentally demanding and could easily lead to fatigue, which could result in errors[93,94].", it is suggested to add "for surgeon". 6. There are some spelling mistakes:
i) In the article "[96]", no superscript is used. ii) In the section of "Patient’s Routine Medications", "[14]" No superscript is used. iii) "Limitations of tachycardia as an early warning sign in patients who are on Beta-blockers should be understood", it is recommended to add a reference or some references.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
An interesting narrative review and well constructed. I applaud for the review on safety in laparoscopic surgery. I only suggest minor revisions especially enlarging the Discussion section mentioning the possibility of laparoscopy not only in elective surgery setting but also in emergency laparoscopy setting and in trauma (evaluating safety and efficacy) and clarifying the indications and patients selection for Diagnostic and eventually therapeutic laparoscopy in the management of abdominal trauma.