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Author's response to reviews: see over
Placenta increta causing hemoperitoneum in the 26\textsuperscript{th} week of pregnancy: a case report

Gentian Vyshka M.D. \textsuperscript{a*},
Nuredin Çapari M.D. \textsuperscript{b}, Elma Zhaqiri M.D. \textsuperscript{c}

feedback letter:

Changes made:

A – Comments made from AE

1. Medial inferior-superior laparotomy is substituted with midline laparotomy.
2. The quantity and type of postoperative blood transfusion are clarified. (The woman received four units of fresh whole blood transfusion (group A Rh positive), saline perfusions and antibiotics.)
3. Reasons why the internal iliac artery ligation was not preferred are given (The surgeon opted not for an arterial ligation procedure, because the quantity of intra-abdominal blood was considerable, and the uterine rupture was considered large enough not to allow a uterus-saving procedure, especially in terms of another perspective pregnancy.)
4. In the case presentation section of the abstract are included the age, sex and ethnic background of the patient.
5. The keywords section is removed.
6. The ethnicity of the patient is included in the case presentation section.
7. Figures are uploaded separately from the main manuscript document.
8. ALL CHANGES ARE HIGHLIGHTED.
9. Linguistic refinements are made; however authors would be grateful for every help from the editorial team, regarding further improvements.
We present the case of a 34 years old Albanian white woman, gravida 2, para 1, diagnosed with a placenta increta causing uterine rupture with massive intra-abdominal hemorrhage; Manuscript: She had another pregnancy fourteen years before that ended up with a cesarean section, giving birth to a healthy child.

This second pregnancy was considered normal from the family obstetrician; two months before her urgent admission she had a sonography, which was considered within the norm.

“Second parous woman” is omitted; the terms gravida 2, para 1 are used. Also, the phrase “concluded through cesarean section” is substituted with her first pregnancy ended up in a cesarean section.
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