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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Nickel, dear Dr. Hakkim,

We received the Re-Revisions of "BIOLAP: Biological versus synthetic mesh in laparo-endoscopic inguinal hernia repair: Study protocol for a randomized multicenter, self-controlled clinical trial (TRLS-D-18-00370)" and changed the correct finding bei Reviewer #5 in the mansucript. The minor revision by reviewer #1 is not something we can change in the already recruiting trial, as the reviewer states himself.

We included the SPIRIT figure in the main manuscript as instructed.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing valuable feedback on our manuscript.
Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments and concerns.

Reviewer #1: The authors choose to keep the variation of meshes and fixation techniques in each group. Furthermore, there will be no monitoring of the procedure performed. Since the trial is funded and in progress it will be interesting to see the results.

Answer: Dear Prof. Dr. med. Kallinowski, thank you for your time and effort, we respect your qualified opinion.

Reviewer #5: The revisions that have been made to the manuscript, have substantially improved the clarity of procedures within this interesting trial. Nearly all comments raised by the reviewers have been addressed sufficiently by the authors. Some issues with the trial design remain (e.g. initial comments #15 and #18), however, these cannot be changed since the trial is already recruiting for quite a while.

In my opinion, the manuscript and can be accepted after few minor corrections:

- There is an ambiguity between the description of trial visits in the text (six visits: Screening, surgery, 1 week, 6 months, 12 months and 24 months) and the figure/table (seven visits: Screening, surgery, POD 1-6, 1 week, 6 months, 12 months and 24 months). Please adjust the text to the figure/table or the other way round to avoid ambiguities.

Answer: Dear Dr. Hüttner, there was indeed a contradiction in between the text and the figure which went by unnoticed before. Thank you for pointing this out, we changed the text accordingly! We appreciate your valuable feedback.

Sincerely,

M. Heiss

S. Seefeldt