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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor, thank you very much for the time and effort you've put into this manuscript. We would also like to thank the reviewers for their suggestions and time spent to analyze this manuscript.

We have carefully reviewed the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Response to reviewer 1

1. Introduction paragraph: line 40 need reference

Answer: references have been included. Introduction section.

2. Please include a small paragraph reporting the other available possibilities for reconstruction (LD Flap, Trapezius Flap, Free Flap) discussing briefly pros and cons compared with pectoralis flap

Answer: a paragraph has been included in the introduction section to address this.
3. Figure 2: The vascular anatomy should be better described providing details on each branch.

Answer: Figure 2 has been updated to describe the vascular anatomy better.

4. The abstract provides a good description of paper although the conclusion section should be improved providing more support to the research.

Answer: The conclusion sections of the abstract and main manuscript has been updated.

5. the flap characteristics are at the base of the proposed classification therefore a more detailed description of each flap variant should be reported

Answer: The results section has been updated to include more detail on each flap variant.

6. Conclusions should support more the utility of this classification

Answer: The conclusion has been updated.

Response to Review 2

1. The authors needed to explain the reasons why the 5 articles were excluded.

Answer: 5 of the articles were excluded because they described the exact same procedures that has been previously described by a different author. The manuscript has been revised under results section.

2. The authors needed to include the indications, such as locations and size of defect, of each type I,II,III.

Answer: The indications of each flap configuration has been updated in the discussion section and included in a new figure, Figure 3.

I hope that the changes we have made could resolve your concerns about the article. Thank you again for your time.
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