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Reviewer’s report:

The authors did a nice job addressing the comments and concerns. Appropriate for publication in the present form.

I still believe that anterior and posterior wall prolapse should be included in the primary outcome. Does a patient care if they need to have a reoperation for recurrent anterior, apical or posterior wall prolapse? Regardless of the compartment, a reoperation for any prolapse will consider a failure of the primary surgery since our goal is to fix all prolapse. In the current format, how will they know if prolapse symptoms are due to anterior, posterior or apical prolapse? I appreciate the changes and will agree to disagree. At least it is a secondary outcome that will be reported since it is very important.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests