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Title: Prolapse of fallopian tube through abdominal wound after caesarean section mimicking scar endometriosis- an unusual case report.

Thanks for submitting your valuable work. This is indeed an interesting case. Please consider the following revisions.

Abstract –
Case presentation:
2nd line – please specify the type of incision for both – abdominal wall as well as cesarean section

Conclusion: The conclusion does not summarize the presentation.
There is no mention for wound dehiscence in the presentation in the abstract, so it is not reasonable to extend the conclusion as inadequate treatment for dehiscence. Also it may not be reasonable to state 6 months presentation as prolonged agony.
The authors are requested to change the conclusions in accordance to presentation or add more details involving the patient presentation in the abstract.

Case presentation
• Please provide more details on the type of discharge from abdominal wound – purulent/ serosanguinous/ frank blood etc., and if antibiotic coverage was provided at this time.
• The statement that the wound healed in one month with a 2 cm area in the incision is conflicting. Please clarify if the defect was persistent since her cesarean section or it healed.
• Please mention if CT or MRI were considered or not considered for further delineation of the mass?
• Please mention as to how long the patient was followed up after the surgery.
• line 5, use patient as singular
Discussion

• Check spelling for hysterectomy (2nd line)

• Please rephrase the sentence no. 6 – the phrase “multiple factors contributing factors” appears repetition of words

• Menstrual bleeding through an open wound with a fistulous tract may not necessarily be a mimicker of scar endometriosis. Usually scar endometriosis presents as pain at the scar site and visible mass or a nodule that increase in size during menstruation. The authors are requested to reconsider this differential diagnosis. Your series also explains cyclical bleeding and swelling as the most common presentation. Having said that, this patient with an open bleeding wound with contiguity with the uterus is now at a higher risk of scar endometriosis and should be followed for the same.

Conclusion

• The phrase “patients perspective” is incomplete.

Image

• Please provide labeling for the image.

• It will be valuable to add any preoperative image if available for the readers to understand the clinical presentation.

• Please consider adding any image with a probe in the tube, or a fistulogram if available.

There are many other minor grammatical and syntax error in the manuscript. The authors are requested to spell check the document and revise the manuscript before resubmitting.
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