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Author's response to reviews:

Málaga, April 22, 2014

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.

Reviewer’s report

Title: Tubal ectopic pregnancy two years after laparoscopic hysterectomy

Version: 2 Date: 5 March 2014

Reviewer: Nalini Gupta

Reviewer's report:
General comments-

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

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

We have changed some paragraphs in the background and discussion. To write the article we followed the instructions for authors from the journal web page. We have included some paragraphs for discussion (lines 15-31 page 4)

2. The case should be more discussed in reference to previous reports.

We have included some paragraphs for discussion. (lines 7-14 page 3) (lines 15-31 page 4)

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

Changed

This case report is not acceptable in the present form. Level of interest: An article of limited interest Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

We have made several language corrections

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.

Reviewer’s report

Title: Tubal ectopic pregnancy two years after laparoscopic hysterectomy

Version: 2

Date: 2 April 2014

Reviewer: Donald Fylstra
Reviewer's report:

I consider bringing attention to post hysterectomy ectopic pregnancies very important, and I think the frequency is increasing.

Correction of wording, grammar and syntext:

Abstract first paragraph:

Should read: but it must be kept in mind in women with a history of hysterectomy "who present with abdominal pain."

It has been changed

Delete "child bearing age" Since "first described" by Wendeler Abstract second paragraph Delete "the last" What is "Ovular"

It has been deleted

Background second paragraph "since first described by Wendeler" Replace "is" with "was" third paragraph: in a few cases vaginal bleeding was...

It has been changed

Background fifth paragraph There is no reference #56.
There was a mistake. We meant reference 5 and 6

Change wording: favor ectopic is a fallopian tube prolapse into the vagina"

It has been changed

Background sixth paragraph:

The commend: pregnancy testing immediately before the procedure could help determine: this is NOT true (pregnancy testing is usually negative, unless a pregnancy is suspected, such as a missed period.)

We have changed the sentence

Case presentation first paragraph Replace supravesical with supracervical

It has been changed

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

It has been changed
Case presentation third paragraph We performed a bilateral salpingectomy with the preservation of both ovaries. How do the authors expect to prevent another ectopic; a fistula tract much has been present in the vagina.

We have included a paragraph to explain how we expect to prevent more cases. (lines 15 to 31, page 3) (line 35, page 5)

The authors bibliography is very limited given over 60 post-hysterectomy ectopics have been reported

We have completed/added references. We have also adapted references style to the journal requirements (lines 4-16, page 7)

Overall, this manuscript can be considerable improved, and if so, would consider a re-review

Editorial Requirements

We have separated the abstract section from the title page