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Pudendal nerve decompression: a basic procedure in perineology
Jacques Beco, Daniela Climov and Michele Bex
BMC Surgery

Sart-Lez-Spa, 20th July 2004

Dear Dr Colleagues,

Here is the covering letter describing the changes made in response to each of the reviewers points.

Reviewer # 1:

Major compulsory revisions:

1) Type of article: In the list of proposal "research article" seems to us to correspond the best with our manuscript. Here is the list: Research article, Case report, Database, Debate, Software, Study protocol, Technical advance.
2) Structure of the article: Dr Bex is included in the author's list. Mrs Daniela Climov was also included in this list for her work on the structure of the manuscript and the statistical analysis. We defined more clearly 2 aims: the first is the study of the effect of PND on symptoms, signs and EMG and the second is the validation of the 3 signs.
3) Article difficult to read: the structure of the manuscript is different, new tables were introduced and focus was put on the cases where PND alone was done to treat the symptom. Our statistician was not able to realize a logistic regression analysis with our data but summarizing tables using cure, improved, failure and worse were introduced.
4) We removed some less essentials parts of the manuscripts to improve the legibility.
5) Discussion: all "the weakness of the study" were put together in a small chapter page 20.
6) Discussion: the "prevalence data" were put in the results chapter.
7) Abstract: we replaced specificity by odds ratio which contains information of both sensibility and specificity.
8) Strict minimum diagnostic criteria were presented page 5.

Minor essential revisions:

Introduction, aim 3: this part was written differently.
Materials and method: we don't introduce "retrospective analysis" because it seems to be logical in such a paper.
Diagnostic criteria: see page 5
Materials and method: the neurophysiological follow-up is presented page 13.
Materials and method: we prefer to present shortly the procedure because very few surgeons know about this approach.
Results: "clear psychological problem" was suppressed.
Results: summarizing tables were introduced.
Results: the 3 signs. With the new tables it should be clearer.
Discussion: "is a relatively frequent event" was suppressed.
Discussion page 10: this part of discussion was suppressed.
Discussion: effect on symptoms: the first paragraph was omitted.
Discussion page 12: introduction of one reference.  
Discussion EMG PNTML: The weakness of neurophysiology was not discussed.  
Tables: abbreviation are explained in a legend.  
Reviewer # 2  
In table 1: references for MVT and levatorplasty were introduced.  

On page 4, the details and results of history were not described because they were very classical and the manuscript is already a little bit long. We insisted on the 3 clinical signs and the symptoms definitions.  

A reference on the "hold and roll test" was introduced but the real name of this test is the "skin rolling test". This new name is in the manuscript.  

Reference 31 was completed.  

I would like to thank you again for your relevant comments and critics.  

Yours faithfully.  

Jacques Beco M.D. Daniela Climov Michele Bex M.D.