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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

This is a REVISED manuscript entitled “Comparative evaluation of sump drainage by trocar puncture, percutaneous catheter drainage versus operative drainage in the treatment of intra-abdominal abscesses: a retrospective controlled study” to be published in BMC Surgery.

All authors have made substantial contributions to this study, read and approved this final version of the manuscript. Due care has been taken to ensure the integrity of the work. I certify that this manuscript, or any part of it, has not been published and will not be submitted elsewhere for publication while being considered by BMC Surgery.

We are most grateful to the editor for your work. We also appreciate the precious comments and suggestions from the reviewer. We made a point-to-point response to all concerns that have been raised, and indicated changes that have been made and on what page the changes appear.

Sincerely yours,

Jinan Ren, MD, FACS
Reviewer's report

Title: Comparative evaluation of sump drainage by trocar puncture, percutaneous catheter drainage versus operative drainage in the treatment of intra-abdominal abscesses: a retrospective controlled study

Version: 2 Date: 12 November 2014

Reviewer: cheng zhou

Reviewer's report:

From the revised paper, we can see the parameters designed for comparison were clearly defined, the mistakes of grammar and spell were corrected, proper and powerful statistical method was added in.

The conclusion is logical and acceptable.

Answer: Dear reviewer, thank you very much for your recognition. We appreciate highly your constructive comments, which helped a lot to improve the quality of this manuscript. Season’s greetings and best wishes to you for the New Year!

The email of each author is provided on the title page as requested. We hope that this manuscript is now acceptable for publication in BMC Surgery. Thank you very much for your time and consideration in the process of revision.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kindest regards,

Jinan Ren, MD, FACS