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Dear Dr Norton,

Thank you very much for inviting us to submit a revised version of our manuscript entitled “Umbilical vein injection of misoprostol versus normal saline for the treatment of retained placenta: intrapartum placebo-controlled trial”. We have extensively revised our manuscript in accordance with the comments of the reviewers. Our point-by-point responses to the comments are given below.

We hope that the revisions to the manuscript and our responses are sufficient to make the manuscript suitable for publication in *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Shahla Alalaf, Assistant Professor
Hawler Medical University
College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology
E-mail: shahla_alaf@yahoo.com, 009647504480711
**Responses to the comments of Reviewer 1:**

1. The blood loss is most appropriately reported as median with \( p \) value only (using the Mann-Whitney test)

The blood loss vaginally reported as median with \( P \) value using Mann-Whitney test, this was clarified in the text and table 2

2. the methods are easiest to read if placed chronologically (e.g. the consent section could follow the first enrolment paragraph)

We have changed the methods section adding the consent section after the first enrolment paragraph as suggested.

3. i still maintain that the numbers recruited should appear for the first time in the results.

The number of recruited women was applied for the first time in the result section.

4. table 1 needs reformatting and combining with table 2

Table 1 and 2 were combined together as Table 1

5. in table 3 only the higher value for blood loss and time to placental separation need to be shown

The range of blood loss vaginally (including the higher value for blood loss) and the range of time to placental separation (including the higher time of placental separation) were shown in Table 2 (Table 3 before correction).

6. the time to placental separation only relates to those delivered by controlled cord traction (i assume). This needs to be explicit in the text and table 3.

The time to placental separation was related to placentas delivered by controlled cord traction and this was used for all sample size. This has been clarified in the revised manuscript and Table 2

7. Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being Published.

The entire manuscript has been revised and corrected by a native English speaker.
**Responses to the comments of Reviewer 2:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. In Patient Characteristics (Result section, page 10): The articles sys that "there is no significant difference of parity, however, the p value is 0.037 (Table 1), which is statistically significant difference.

   This apparent difference was an error, and has been corrected in the revised manuscript.

2. In Outcomes after UVI (Result section, page 10):
   2.1 I don't quite understand the meaning of the "mean rank" of blood loss.
   2.2 the difference in the mean rank of blood loss is NOT correct (13.52 mL vs 33.48 mL, mean difference -126.696????), this is also incorrect in Table 3.

   Mann-Whitney test was used to compare the median volume of blood loss between the two groups according to the suggestion of the first reviewer, so the mean rank difference and confidence interval was removed from the text and Table 2

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. The word "difference" are misspelled in Table 3.
   This word has been removed from the table.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

The entire manuscript has been revised and corrected by a native English speaker.