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Author's response to reviews:

To,

The editor,

Journal of medical case reports.

Sir,

I have received review letters from three reviewers. Am happy to accept their views and I have made the necessary corrections. My sincere thanks to all the reviewers. Please convey.

I would like to give a point by point explanation to the review letter sent by dr. Florent FUCHS.

1. The word secondary has been mentioned in all the places to stress the fact that it was not a primary abdominal pregnancy. It was because of rupture of rudimentary horn. I agree to your view that it has been mentioned everywhere. I have now removed it from the abstract and case report. I have mentioned it in the title alone as I feel that it is worth mentioning.

2. ABSTRACT

Sir, the sentence beginning with the word preoperatively has been shortened in a manner that is understood by all.

3. CASE

Early pregnancy was uneventful and an early or prepregnancy ultrasound was not done. I have now made a mention in the case. Sorry for not making a mention earlier.

Amniotic fluid in the 22 weeks ultrasound was normal and the ultrasound
performed before discharging the patient was normal. This could have the probable time of rupture which was a silent one. It was probably missed by ultrasound and hence I have mentioned in the discussion that the contour of the uterus should be looked at in every case, in order to diagnose such a rare case.

The figure is given to show that histopathological confirmation was done and there was presence of uterine smooth muscle tissue. I have now made a mention in the text. Thank you sir.

4. DISCUSSION

The reference numbers have been reviewed and corrected. Sorry for the mistake in coating the reference numbers.

Sir, I have presented a few cases found in the literature and how the diagnosis was made in those cases. In most of the cases found in the literature the diagnosis was made intraoperatively.

The two sentences beginning with “in spite of “and “Incidence” mean almost the same. I have deleted one sentence from the discussion. Thank you.

The sentence beginning with Abnormal has been changed and made clearer. Hope it is now made clear.

Sir I have made the necessary corrections as mentioned above. Kindly review my article and I would welcome if there are any more suggestions from you. Thank you.

I would like you to forward it to Dr Florent FUCHS on my behalf. Waiting to receive mail from the journal soon.

Thanking You,

Yours sincerely,

Sumangali t