

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52342

Date: 19-06-2025

Title: Review Article: Optimizing Operating Room Setup and Patient Positioning in Robotic Gynecologic Surgery

Recommendation:

Accept as it is.....**YES**.....

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		√		
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity			√	
Significance			√	

Reviewer's Name: Dr Aamina

Reviewer's Decision about Paper: **Recommended for Publication.**

Comments (*Use additional pages, if required*)

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Title:

The title is informative, specific, and reflective of the content. It clearly communicates the focus on optimization strategies for both operating room setup and patient positioning in the context of robotic gynecologic surgery. It is appropriate for a review article intended for a clinical and academic audience.

Abstract:

The abstract is well-structured and concise. It outlines the purpose of the review, the sources of information used (a comprehensive chapter, presentation, and recent literature), and the main thematic areas addressed. Key concepts such as 'side docking', modified dorsal lithotomy, and Trendelenburg positioning are introduced, along with an emphasis on patient safety and surgical efficiency. The summary also notes potential complications and offers mitigation strategies, making it comprehensive and aligned with the objectives of a clinical review.

Introduction:

The introduction provides a clear rationale for the article. It places robotic-assisted gynecologic surgery within the broader context of surgical innovation and underlines the increasing importance of mastering OR logistics and patient positioning to ensure successful outcomes. The narrative flows logically from

REVIEWER'S REPORT

the growing popularity of robotic surgery to the specific technical challenges that necessitate structured guidelines and best practices.

Preoperative Preparation:

This section effectively emphasizes the importance of patient selection and risk assessment. The mention of various comorbid conditions (e.g., obesity, pulmonary or cardiovascular issues) highlights the need for multidisciplinary evaluation. The incorporation of recommendations from a referenced chapter, including patient counseling and informed consent, enhances the clinical rigor of the article. The discussion is balanced, methodical, and relevant to the practical demands of robotic surgical planning.

Use of Sources:

The article draws on multiple forms of scholarly and clinical input—namely a chapter, a presentation, and current literature. This triangulated approach supports the comprehensiveness and relevance of the information presented. Citations are used effectively to attribute specific guidance (e.g., “[Chapter, p. 2]”).

Clarity and Style:

The language is precise, professional, and appropriate for the target readership of gynecologic surgeons, surgical trainees, and OR personnel. Terminology is used correctly, and the tone maintains a high level of academic and clinical professionalism. The structure of the text is logical, and each section transitions smoothly into the next.

Relevance and Contribution:

The review addresses a highly practical and critical aspect of robotic surgery, namely, the operational logistics that influence outcomes. Given the continued expansion of robotic platforms in gynecology, the synthesis of evidence-based practices regarding OR setup and patient positioning is timely and valuable. It contributes meaningfully to surgical education and clinical practice optimization.

Overall Evaluation:

This review article demonstrates clarity, coherence, and clinical relevance. It is grounded in reliable sources and addresses both technical and patient-centered aspects of robotic gynecologic surgery. The organization of the content, alongside its practical orientation, makes it a useful resource for surgical practitioners aiming to refine their approach to robotic procedures.