E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Ismail Dergaa (ID)	**Reviewer 1:** Adbul Rehman Zia Zaidi (ID)
High Institute of Sport and Physical Education of Kef, Jendouba, Kef, Tunisia.	Department of Family and Community Medicine College of Medicine, Alfaisal University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
	Email: Arzaidi@alfaisal.edu
Primary Health Care Corporation (PHCC), Doha, Qatar.	**Reviewer 2:** Helmi Ben Saad (ID)
	University of Sousse, Farhat HACHED Hospital, Sousse, Tunisia
Email: Phd.dergaa@gmail.com	Email: helmi.bensaad@rns.tn

1.   Round 1

1.1   Reviewer 1

Date: 13 November 2023

Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript.

General comments:
I believe the authors have conducted a well-designed study on an interesting and novel topic. The findings will contribute valuable insights into an understudied population and have implications for medical education, especially around robotic surgery training. I recommend only minor revisions to improve readability and context, then acceptance for publication. This is a worthwhile study for the journal readership. Please feel free to contact me if you would like me to clarify or expand on any of my comments. I am happy to provide

Specific comments:
- In the abstract conclusion, rephrase "Syria's 11 years of war..." to something more neutral like "The ongoing conflict in Syria has impacted medical education and training, reducing exposure to newer technologies." Avoid wording that seems overly political.

- In the introduction, provide more background on the adoption of robotic surgery specifically in Syria and the Middle East region. Are there any statistics on number of robotic surgery centers or procedures performed? How does adoption compare to other parts of the world? This context will help readers understand the relevance.

- In the results section, consider reducing some lengthy descriptive portions to improve readability and flow. For example paragraphs such as "Table 2: Descriptive data..." could be shortened to focus only on key findings.

- Be consistent with verb tense throughout - some portions shift between past and present tense. Using past tense throughout would be preferable.

- Review for any minor grammatical errors. For example "On the Google form website, a sample of 862 participants was invited to participate in this survey; however, seven respondents were rejected, reducing the sample size to 855." could be improved by splitting into two sentences.

- Consider adding a limitation around potential sampling bias by recruiting participants through social media. How representative is this of all Syrian medical students?

- Finally, although the manuscript is of good quality, I would recommend getting your final manuscript proofread by a native English speaker to correct minor errors.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Date: 14 November 2023

I read with a great interest the paper entitled: Attitudes of Syrian Medical Students Regarding Robotic Surgery: Cross Sectional Study.
Below are my remarks (in addition to the other remarks inside the manuscript)
GENERAL REMARKS
Avoid elegant variation of terms: for example use participant not respondent, knowledge not awareness,
TITLES
Add a short title
See manuscript
ABTRACT
See the manuscript.
Avoid beginning sentence with numerical data.
KEYWORDS
Avoid citing as keywords some terms previously cited in the title or the abstract
Opt for MeSH terms
Classify the keywords in alphabetical order
INTRODUCTION
Several sentence are lacking references (see the manuscript)
L63: define PUMA
L64: define ROBODOCR
METHODS
*More details are needed for this sentence: "The online questionnaire was derived from previous research in the literature [17], and then adapted for local Syrians." What do you mean by adapted? How the questionnaire was adapted? You are asked to add the questionnaire as an appendix (at the end of the reference section).
*L100: how the 15 participants were selected (convenience sampling?)
*L100: define SEU?
*How participants were selected. In other terms how it was possible for the authors to determine the Facebook, WhatsApp, and Telegram of the participants. This is a crucial point.
*l103-104: this sentence in incomplete (where is the verb?): According to the Syrian Ministry of Health's latest report (https://www.moh.gov.sy/), around 28214 medical students.
L111: please detail the 2 parts of the questionnaire (part 1 concerns the .....Part 2 is linked to ...)
L115: avoid to use etc. More precision is needed...
L120: which college? I advise the authors to briefly describe (in the beginning of this section) the medical studies in Syria: first cycle; second cycle, third cycle, specialities....What about the language of medical studies (is it Arabic?)
The questionnaire must be added at the end of the paper.

L125-126: "Categorical variables on sociodemographic characteristics of the parents were expressed using descriptive statistics and frequencies.": no information was given in the methods section about the parents characteristics? More details is needed?

L127: How normal distribution was tested: more rigour is needed.

L86: the authors talk about undergraduate medical students, and in the methods section, no word about undergraduate medical students (in other terms: what is an undergraduate medical students in Syria?

Authors are asked to add a figure flow chart for their study?

In brief,

*More details about the survey: language, duration of the questionnaire, add an appendix, how the survey was adapted for Syrian language,

*recruitment methods: for the 15 participants, and the all population

*More details about the collected data of students and parents

*How many governmental and private medical colleges exist in Syria? What is the total number of undergraduate medical students and at which university year?

*You should inform reader that in Syria, there is a robotic surgery center (describe it briefly, and what is its main mission, who can go there)?

RESULTS

L140-141: age was expressed ad median (standard deviation)? This is an aberration. Use mean (SD) or median (IQR). Moreover, in the subsection statistical analysis, please describe the mode of expression of your quantitative data?

All data reported in Table 1 MUST BE REPORTED and described in the methods section

See all other changes inside the manuscript: all variables and their categories MUST BE DEFINED AND INTRODUCED in the methods section.

DISUCSSION

This important section must be well reorganised into several subsections.

L228-229: unclear sentence: Due to the cost-effectiveness of cross-sectional research, it cannot be used to prove causation.

REFERENCES

All this section must be revised: please opt for the Vancouver style, and homogenise the way you present your references…

Reference 29 must be numbered 18, and therefore correct the remaining references…

ILLUSTRATIONS

See inside your paper

2. Round 2

2.1 Reviewer 2

Date: 18 November 2023

I read with a great attention the revised version of the paper titled "Attitudes of Medical Students Regarding Robotic Surgery: A Cross Sectional Study". The authors tried to improve the scientific quality of their paper. However, their answer to my remarks were superficial and often they report as answer "Done".

I tried to help the authors to improve their paper, and I introduced several changes inside the paper. However, several other changes are needed (see the revised version, the text in yellow).

I am surprised to see several weakness inside the paper and I am wondering if all the authors read this version. For example, the authors reported [link] inside the paper and no link was added. Moreover, the authors stated that "Utilizing

the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, we determined that there were no normally distributed continuous outcomes, including survey scores" but after that they report that "t-test (for normal distribution of continuous data)? This is a source of confusion. In brief, more rigor is needed, and the paper MUST be checked by a statistician and all the authors must approve the final version.

The quality of table is very bed and I am surprised how the authors accept to submit such a table for a medical journal??? More rigor is needed.

The authors reported that "Written informed consent was obtained from all participants", which is impossible for online surveys.

Again and again the references section MUST BE checked. For examples write the abbreviate journal names (ref 3, 4, 7, 8, 11,), add the journal abbreviated name (ref 5, 9, 12) This is a serious point.

In brief, this will be your last chance to improve the scientific quality of your paper.

3. Round 3

3.1 Reviewer 2

Date: 22 November 2023

I read the revised version of the paper. I am really surprise by the authors' response to my previous remarks. 12 authors failed to correct this paper. When I examined the references section, I was stupefied by the fact that at least 8 references are lacking journal names…

In brief,

1. I have corrected the paper. The authors are asked to add some lacking references, put the references in the right numbers, (see the corrected file)
2. The final sample is a source of confusion: is it 855 or 862 or 863?
3. I have corrected the sample size section, and other sections
4. I have improved the tables and the Results section.

4. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.