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To:

Prof Dr Per-Göran Larsson
Editor of BMC Women´s Health Journal

Dear Sir

We wish to thank the careful reading made of our article, as well as the comments and contributions, which undoubtedly have served to improve the study. We are deeply grateful for the review.

We have done our best to incorporate the recommendations of the specialists who have reviewed the paper. These changes are detailed below, and highlighted in the submitted text. We hope that the revised version of the manuscript can now be accepted for publication.

Editorial Requirements

We have separated the abstract section from the title page

Referee 1

The case does not provide any new information. As ectopic pregnancies although uncommon are described occasionally in women after hysterectomy.

To our knowledge, the case that we report is the second ectopic pregnancy reported after laparoscopic supracervical hysterectomy. Anyway, we have included all the new cases of ectopic pregnancy after hysterectomy reported after the review articles published by Filstra and Saad Aldin

The background is too lengthy and there is hardly any discussion.

We have changed some paragraphs in the background.

Pathology can be described more, whether chorionic villi were seen on histopathological examination.

Changed

Referee 2

Abstract first paragraph:
"who present with abdominal pain."

Changed

Delete "child bearing age"
Since "first described" by Wendeler

Abstract second paragraph
Delete "the last"

Background second paragraph
"since first described by Wendeler"

Background fifth paragraph
There is no reference #56.

"prolapse into the vagina"

Background sixth paragraph:
The commend: pregnancy testing immediately before the procedure could help determine: this is NOT true

Case presentation first paragraph
Replace supravesical with supracervical

Case presentation second paragraph
The abdomen proved "tender" (not painful)

We have also

Added the word "laparoscopic" in the Title for a better description of the reported case
Adapted References style to the journal requirements
Completed/added references
Included Table 1 with the last reported cases