Reviewer's report

Title: Oncological Outcome and Patient Satisfaction with Skin-Sparing Mastectomy and Immediate Breast Reconstruction: A Prospective Observational Study.

Version: 3 Date: 20 March 2010

Reviewer: Adel Denewer

Reviewer's report:

Minor Revision

Comments to the Authors:

• You have successfully addressed most of my concerns. However, there are still some important issues to address. Should you wish to have this paper submitted for publication you need to adhere?
• Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document or by using bold or colored text.

In introduction and background:

• "A recent postal questionnaire survey of 370 Californian surgeons suggests that attitudes and practices may also be changing, with 90% of respondents satisfied with oncological adequacy and 70% in agreement with regard to superior aesthetic outcome". I would still suggest that the previous paragraph to be transferred into the introduction after the paragraph " More than one third of breast surgeons have been reported to avoid SSM and IBR because of concerns over oncological safety or uncertainty of the benefits or indications"

In Methods:

• The base on which the authors select the patients to perform one of the two procedures LD pedicle-flap and implant or implant only. This has to be clarified in the manuscript as you mentioned in your response.

• Your explanation of why the contra-lateral surgery was performed despite the initial implant used in all cases was a tissue expander, should be mentioned in the manuscript.

• Again, readers need to know how the type and length of incision was selected in relation to breast cup size.

• It would be interesting to add an algorism describing the stream of choice of surgical procedures (not detailed technical and procedural guidance) to make it easier to remember during the follow-up reading.

In Results:

• "Negative suction drains were used in all patients with a median period of 5 days for the LD donor-site" This is very short period enough to explain why all
patients in your study undergoing LD flap reconstruction developed donor-site seromas. This item needs comment

- Two patients receive blood transfusion; this event is omitted in the revised form. Please add your clarification in the manuscript.

In Discussion:

- In page 13: The authors state that "This complication has been estimated to occur in 11% of SSM and non-SSM cases [16]." The reference number 16 is old; please compare your results with recent ones.

- It would be very interesting to add a title discussing shortly the results of extended latissimus dorsi myocautenous flap as a single-stage procedure of totally autologous breast reconstruction and adding all your comments mentioned in your response. Many reports proved that extended latissimus dorsi flap allows single-stage, totally autologous reconstruction with satisfactory aesthetic results and low morbidity (1&2).

I urge you to continue making amendments to this paper.
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