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The migration of suture material in our case might have occurred in superficial subcutaneous tissue layers through the horizontal flow or movement of those layers in the recovery process that have not been revealed. To our knowledge, there was no report regarding and suggesting the flow or movement of subcutaneous layer during the recovery of longitudinal surgical wound of abdomen, and the migration of suture material after cesarean section. Perhaps this case report can be the clue to understanding the movement of human tissue during surgical wound recovery.
Dear Dr. Tom Rowles,
Senior Executive Editor, BMC surgery

Thank you very much for your sincere letter on September 30, 2014. We have carefully read the reviewers’ constructive comments and suggestions and answered you on each issue point-by-point below. We hope that we have answered the reviewers’ comments adequately. We understand that final acceptance depends on satisfactory resolution of these issues.

Seven major compulsory revisions and one minor essential revision were raised by two reviewers:

**Reply to reviewer 1:**

Thank you for your appropriate comments. We have tried our best to accommodate all the comments and have revised the manuscript as follows.

Comment 1:
Please change “cesarean delivery” to “cesarean section” (in almost all parts). Considering the context, “cesarean delivery” mat be OK in some parts.

Answer 1:
We changed “cesarean delivery” to “cesarean section” in all parts of revised manuscript including the title of case report (page 1, line 2; page 2, line 2; page 2.
Comment 2:
Page 4, line 13; premature rupture of the membranes (Please delete “amniotic”)

Answer 2:
We deleted “amniotic” from the sentence (page 4, line 14), as the reviewer’s recommendation.

Comment 3:
Page 5, line 4; Please specify the thread; Maker, Place, and Nation. This is essential, considering the present context.

Answer 3:
We appreciate for reviewer’s accurate indication. We have added the required information on the revised manuscript (page 5, line 5), as following: (AILEE Inc., Busan, South Korea)

Comment 4:
The same, line; Delete “2012 August”.

Answer 4:
We have deleted those words from the revised manuscript (page 5, line 8).
Comment 5:
The same, line 11; “that had not been removed completely during the hospital stay”: Please describe whether did you (try to) remove the thread during the hospital stay? I believe that the threads are 000 and thus you remained it un-removed. Did you (try to) remove the ones?

Answer 5:
To explain the situation more clearly, we have change the sentence “The wound dressing was done until postoperative day 4, and the patient was discharged the next day” to as following: “Distal part of that string was snapped during the wound dressing on postoperative day 4 and the resident allowed that patient to discharge on the next day without stitch-out the remaining string.” (page 5, line 5-8 in the revised manuscript)

Comment 6:
Page 6; Please confirm you can directly go to “conclusion” without “comment” or “discussion”. Is this the style of this journal?

Answer 6:
Yes. Based on the “instructions for authors” on website of this journal (http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmcsurg/authors/instructions/casereport), we drew up “conclusion” in the manuscript without “comment” or “discussion”.

Comment 7:
Page 6, line 12, I understand that this migration (movement) of a long thread is quite
a rare phenomenon. Please describe whether this is for the first time report of this phenomenon. How rare? Only “rare” is not scientific expression. Definitely describe whether such a phenomenon has been OR has not been reported. Is this the first report ever? Of course it is OK to describe “to our knowledge”. Please describe how you retrieve the literature when concluding (describing) so. (for example: This phenomenon has never been reported to our knowledge. We retrieved the related literatures via PubMed with the index words “X”. etc)

Answer 7:
The reviewer’s comment is quite reasonable. To our knowledge, there have been no reports about the migration of such long suture materials with long distance as in the present case. To make it clear, we have added the following sentences in the revised manuscript: “The migration of relatively long materials as in the present case has never been reported to our knowledge. We retrieved the related literatures via PubMed with the index words ‘migration’, ‘movement’, ‘suture material’.” (from page 6, line 15, to page 7, line 2)

Reply to reviewer 2:
Thank you for your appropriate comments. We have tried our best to accommodate all the comments and have revised the manuscript as follows.

Comment 1:
It would be useful to know if there was record of any part of the suture being removed in the hospital - it would help the reader understand if this can happen as part of standard practice or whether this was perhaps a deviation from normal care?
And a recommendation for practitioners might make this more relevant to practice? perhaps to secure the suture material at the edges of the wound or to check for completeness on removal.

Answer 1:
The reviewer’s comment is quite reasonable. To explain the situation more clearly, we have change the sentence “The wound dressing was done until postoperative day 4, and the patient was discharged the next day” to as following: “Distal part of that string was snapped during the wound dressing on postoperative day 4 and the resident allowed that patient to discharge on the next day without stitch-out the remaining string” (page 5, line 5-8 in the revised manuscript)
And we have also added the following sentence as a recommendation for practitioners: “Careful exploration around the surgical wound might be helpful in those situations.” (page 8, line 8)

We appreciate the thoroughness with which the reviewers regarded our paper and hope that it is now suitable for publication in **BMC Surgery**. Thank you very much for your consideration.
We look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best regards,

Soon-Cheol Hong, MD, PhD
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