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Your second point has to do with the definition of recurrence and the risks of operating on large hiatal hernias. We are aware of your outstanding published results and your careful long-term follow-up for a median of 96 months. We used an experienced study coordinator to help with the 1-year follow-up. She (JVP) had to persuade many of our patients, particularly those that are feeling well, to return for a 1-year follow-up or to undergo any further diagnostic imaging. Our group was also troubled by the commonly used definition of a recurrence after laparoscopic hernia repair, defined as a gastroesophageal junction greater than 2 cm above the hiatus. We all know that the gastroesophageal junction should be below the hiatus, and we wanted to highlight this point in our study. We also wanted our results to be interpreted fairly compared with other contemporary series, so we reported both recurrence rates (any recurrence and small recurrences not always reported in other series). We appreciate your comments and hope that future studies of giant paraesophageal hernias, or large type III and IV hernias, use a more accurate definition of recurrence.
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PARAESOPHAGEAL HERNIAS: “YOU SAY POTATO, I SAY POTATO”

Reply to the Editor:

We greatly appreciate the commentary and questions raised by Dr Mattioli in regard to our recently published study on the 1-year follow-up of giant paraesophageal hernia repairs.1 The first issue is with our use of the term “giant paraesophageal hernia.” We defined the condition in our study as “gastric herniation of 30% or more through the diaphragmatic hiatus on preoperative imaging.” This definition has been widely used over the past decade, most notably by Dr James Luketich and colleagues2 as published in the Journal. In addition, a search of the PubMed database using the term “giant paraesophageal hernia” shows 10 publications using this term from 2017.3 The hernias that we described, which are predominantly type III and IV hiatal hernias, are commonly referred to as “paraesophageal hernias” because the stomach herniates beside some of the esophagus. Many of our patients had very large hernias...