



### REVIEWER'S REPORT

**Manuscript No.:** IJAR-56352

**Title:** Review Article on Future Status of Robotic Assisted Surgeries in Developing Countries,

**Recommendation:**

Accept as it is .....

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision .....YES.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

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

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

#### OVERALL EVALUATION

This manuscript provides a narrative overview of the evolution of robotic surgery, with special emphasis on the da Vinci Surgical System developed by Intuitive Surgical and discusses its potential integration in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

The topic is timely and relevant within the broader context of global surgical equity and technological advancement.

#### STRENGTHS

##### 1. Relevant and Contemporary Topic

Addresses technological disparities in global surgical care.

Aligns with global surgery initiatives and modernization of healthcare systems.

##### 2. Comprehensive Historical Overview

Provides a clear chronological account from early robotic systems (PUMA, AESOP, ZEUS) to modern robotic platforms.

Includes landmark telesurgery events such as transatlantic robotic surgery reported in Nature.

##### 3. Balanced Presentation

Discusses both benefits (infection reduction, tele-mentoring, improved ergonomics) and challenges (cost, training, connectivity).

Highlights educational and research opportunities in LMICs.

##### 4. Adequate Referencing

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

References include reputable sources such as JAMA Network Open and other peer-reviewed journals.

### WEAKNESSES

#### 1. Absence of Methodological Framework

No description of literature search strategy.

No PRISMA flow diagram or defined inclusion/exclusion criteria.

This limits scientific rigor and reproducibility.

#### 2. Excessive Descriptive Content

Historical sections are overly detailed.

More emphasis is placed on technological evolution than on LMIC-specific analysis.

#### 3. Limited Critical Appraisal

Lacks comparative analysis between robotic, laparoscopic, and open surgery in LMIC settings.

No data synthesis tables or quantitative comparisons.

#### 4. Insufficient LMIC-Specific Data

Few real-world statistics from developing countries.

No country-specific case studies (e.g., India, Africa, Southeast Asia).

#### 5. Language and Formatting Issues

Minor grammatical inconsistencies.

Typographical symbols need correction.

Reference formatting inconsistencies observed.

#### 6. No Visual Aids

No tables, figures, or graphical summaries to enhance clarity.

### SIGNIFICANCE

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

The manuscript is **conceptually significant** because:

It addresses healthcare technology inequality.

It explores future scalability of robotic surgery in resource-limited settings.

It contributes to policy-level discussions regarding surgical modernization.

However:

Scientific novelty is moderate.

Similar narrative reviews already exist.

Impact would increase with stronger analytical depth and updated LMIC statistics.

**Overall Significance: Moderate to Good**

## KEY POINTS

Evolution of robotic surgery from early systems to the modern Da Vinci era.

Technical advantages of robotic surgery:

3D visualization

Motion scaling

Enhanced dexterity

Potential LMIC benefits:

Reduced surgical site infections

Increased surgical capacity via telesurgery

Educational advancement

Major barriers:

High capital and per-procedure costs

Infrastructure limitations

Training shortages

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Internet latency constraints (<300 ms requirement)

Future recommendations:

Public-private partnerships

Local manufacturing

International collaboration

Tele-mentoring models

## RECOMMENDATION

**Decision:** Major Revision Required

The manuscript has strong thematic value but requires substantial improvement before publication.

## JUSTIFICATION FOR MAJOR REVISION

**Manuscript:** *Review Article on Future Status of Robotic Assisted Surgeries in Developing Countries*

### Absence of Review Methodology (Major Scientific Limitation)

**Issue:**

The manuscript does not describe:

Databases searched

Search strategy

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

Time period covered

Study selection process

**Why This Is Major:**

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

For a review article, methodological transparency is essential for:

Reproducibility

Bias reduction

Scientific credibility

Without methodology, the article reads as a **narrative opinion piece** rather than a structured scholarly review.

### Required Correction:

Add a dedicated **Methodology Section** (e.g., databases: PubMed, Scopus; keywords; time frame; screening process).

### Overemphasis on Historical Description (Structural Imbalance)

#### Issue:

Approximately 50–60% of the manuscript focuses on:

Early robotic systems (PUMA, AESOP, ZEUS)

Detailed technical features of the da Vinci Surgical System

Corporate development of Intuitive Surgical

#### Why This Is Major:

The manuscript title emphasizes:

*Future Status in Developing Countries*

However, the majority of content focuses on:

Historical evolution

Technical engineering details

This creates a **mismatch between title and content emphasis**.

### Required Correction:

Condense historical section to 2–3 paragraphs and expand:

LMIC case studies

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Policy analysis

Cost models

Implementation strategies

### **Lack of Critical Comparative Analysis**

#### **Issue:**

The manuscript lists advantages but does not critically compare:

Robotic vs laparoscopic surgery

Robotic vs open surgery

Cost-benefit ratios in LMIC context

#### **Why This Is Major:**

High-quality review articles synthesize evidence, not just describe it.

For example:

No comparative complication rates table

No meta-analytical synthesis

No strength-of-evidence grading

#### **Required Correction:**

Add:

Comparative outcome table

Cost comparison chart

Evidence strength summary

### **Insufficient LMIC-Specific Data**

#### **Issue:**

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

The manuscript mentions LMICs but:

No country-wise implementation data

No statistics on number of robotic systems in Africa, India, Southeast Asia

No government policy examples

### Why This Is Major:

The article's core focus is **developing countries**, yet evidence is generalized.

References such as:

Lancet Global Health

Nature

JAMA Network Open

are cited, but LMIC-specific synthesis is weak.

### Required Correction:

Include:

Case examples (India, Brazil, South Africa)

Public-private model examples

National robotic surgery adoption statistics

### Limited Critical Discussion of Cost-Effectiveness

#### Issue:

Cost-effectiveness is mentioned but:

No economic modeling

No per-QALY analysis

No cost amortization discussion

### Why This Is Major:

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Financial feasibility is the **central barrier** in LMICs.  
Without strong economic evaluation, conclusions remain speculative.

### Required Correction:

Add:

Capital cost breakdown

Maintenance cost analysis

Long-term vs short-term cost comparison

### Connectivity and Telesurgery Discussion Is Superficial

#### Issue:

Mentions 300 ms latency threshold but:

No technical feasibility modeling

No telecom infrastructure data

#### Why This Is Major:

Telesurgery feasibility depends on:

Fiber penetration

5G coverage

Data redundancy systems

Without data, conclusions remain theoretical.

### No Visual Aids or Structured Tables

#### Issue:

The manuscript contains:

No summary table

No figure

No conceptual model

#### Why This Is Major:

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Review articles should enhance clarity through:

Summary diagrams

Comparative tables

Framework models

### Language and Formatting Inconsistencies

#### Issue:

Typographical symbols (— —)

Minor grammatical inconsistencies

Reference formatting irregularities

#### Why This Is Major:

Individually minor, but collectively affect publication quality.

### Novelty Level Is Moderate

#### Issue:

Several narrative reviews already exist on:

Evolution of robotic surgery

Global surgery challenges

#### Why This Is Major:

To justify publication, the manuscript must:

Provide stronger synthesis

Offer new analytical perspective

Include updated LMIC statistics (2023–2026 data)

### Conclusion Section Is Conceptual, Not Evidence-Based

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### Issue:

Conclusion states robotic surgery “*has potential*” but:

No structured policy framework

No implementation roadmap

### Why This Is Major:

High-impact reviews conclude with:

Actionable frameworks

Tiered implementation models

Strategic recommendations

### WHY THIS IS MAJOR REVISION (Not Minor)

#### Minor Revision

#### Major Revision

Grammar fixes	Add methodology section
Formatting correction	Structural rebalancing of content
Minor clarification	Add comparative analysis
Reference update	Include LMIC-specific evidence
Language polishing	Strengthen economic evaluation

The manuscript requires:

Structural modification

Additional analytical content

Expansion of LMIC evidence

Methodological clarification

These changes are substantial → hence **Major Revision**.

### Final Justified Decision

**Recommendation: MAJOR REVISION**

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT