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Melissa Norton  
Editor-in-Chief  
*BMC Urology*  
Middlesex House  
34-42 Cleveland Street  
London, W1T 4LB United Kingdom  

Re: Manuscript Number 1880235769397992

Dear Dr. Norton,

Thank you for taking the time to review our submitted manuscript entitled *A Multicenter Prospective Trial Evaluating Fetal Bovine Dermal Graft (Xenform® Matrix) For Pelvic Reconstructive Surgery.*

Below is a detailed response to the referees’ comments; all changes have been redlined within the manuscript.

We appreciate your consideration and hope that our work meets with approval from *BMC Urology.*

Sincerely,

Howard B. Goldstein, DO, MPH, FACOG  
*Corresponding Author*  
Director of Research and Education  
Center for Urogynecology and Pelvic Surgery  
4735 Ogletown-Stanton Road  
MAP II, Suite 1208  
Newark, DE 19713  
Phone: 302-623-4055  
Fax: 302-623-6498  
Email: hgoldstein2009@gmail.com
Response to Reviewer Comments

We thank Drs. Mathews and North for their review and comments. We have addressed Dr. Mathews’ suggestion with changes to the discussion section, as detailed below. All changes are tracked within the redlined version manuscript.

Referee 1 (Dr. Ranjiv Mathews): This is a non randomised trial with the use of a xenograft for the management of urinary incontinence in women. The success rates at 6 months were similar to the rates at one year. There was an 88% success at one year in this group that had various repairs using the xenograft. Although this is a good success rate, it is an initial experience and longer term data would be essential. It would be good to see a section in the discussion comparing how this material compares to other currently available materials for pelvic floor reconstruction and compare this to the one year results of these other materials.

Author Response:

In accordance with Dr. Mathew’s suggestion, we have added a paragraph to the discussion section comparing the outcomes of this study to other currently available biologic and synthetic materials for pelvic floor reconstruction. Changes are tracked within the manuscript. The following text in red has also been added to acknowledge the need for longer-term follow up: “This single-arm, non-randomized study is limited by the lack of a control arm and the relatively small number of patients. The results from this trial should be confirmed within a larger, double-blind study. In addition, studies with longer follow-up beyond 1 year will be needed.”

Referee 1 (Dr. Amanda C. North): This article uses validated questionnaires to evaluate the efficacy of this novel graft material. The methods are sound. Most patients completed the study and the adverse outcomes are clearly defined.

Author Response:

No changes requested by referee.