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Dear Editor,

Thank you for letter dated 5 May 2014. We really appreciate the reviewer for providing valuable comments which certainly helped us in improving our manuscript further. We have revised the paper following reviewers' suggestions.

Below is the detailed reply to referees' comments. For convenience, we used blue colour font while answering the queries raised by the reviewers.

Reviewer: Sean Galvin

The reviewer mentioned that, “The authors present a case of urethral leiomyoma treated with local excision. The case is interesting and worthy of publication and describes a relatively uncommon tumour of the urethra”

First of all, thank you very much for considering this case to be worth publishing. We appreciate your valuable suggestions which certainly helped us to refine our manuscript.

Compulsory revision:

Comment 1: The manuscript needs to be rewritten with focus on avoiding repetition and contradictory statements so that it is clearer and easier to follow for the reader, although I comprehend what the authors were saying I believe the manuscript could be re-written so that it is easier for the reader to follow. They seem to jump between discussion about leiomyoma in general and specific urethral malignancies which can be confusing for the reader, they frequently describe the tumor as both "rare" and "common"

Response: We agree with you. Following your suggestion, we have carried out a major reorganization of both “introduction” and “discussion” in order to maintain a logical sequence throughout the manuscript; especillay, we have taken care of the confusion created by mentioning correctly which type of leiomyomas are rare and which are common. We hope our revision has improved readability and clarity.
Comment 2: “The majority of tumor is malignnt, and most are carcinomas and are more common in females than in males”

Response: Thank you for pointing out the issue. We have deleted such misleading statement.

Comment 3: Hypertension and diabetes should removed from the sentence, “she had two caesarean deliveries in the past but had no chronic disease (hypertension and diabetes)

Response: We removed them in the revised manuscript.

Comment 4: The following sentence needs to reworded to remove redundancy: “Resection tumor was removed with sub-urethral...”

Response: We reframed the sentence following your suggestion.

We have rewritten and reorganized the entire manuscript following the suggestion of the respected reviewer. We sincerely thank the reviewer and the Editor-in-chief for their valuable comments and giving us another opportunity to represent our work.

With best regards

Mário Maciel de Lima Junior