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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Editors,

We wish to submit a manuscript revision entitled “Laparoscopic Repair On Vescovaginal Fistulae With The Transperitoneal Approach: The Initial Report Of The Universitas Gadjah Mada Urological Institute” for consideration by the Journal of Medical Case Reports

We confirm that this work is original and has not been published elsewhere nor is it currently under consideration for publication elsewhere. All authors listed have contributed sufficiently to the project to be included as authors, and all those who are qualified to be authors are listed in the author byline. To the best of our knowledge, no conflict of interest, financial or other, exists.

In my submission process, you have assessed my manuscript and if at some stage we are able to fully address these concerns, we may wish to submit a revised manuscript.

1. I am sorry to say, that I still do not understand if the vaginal defect was closed or not. In the previous version it was clearly stated that the vaginal defect was not closed. In this revised version the authors state that the vaginal defect was closed with running suture. If this is the case then this paper does not report anything new. The closure of both defects is the typical approach performed either open or laparoscopically. I understand that this case report is important for the authors but not for the scientific community, because this procedure is in use for several years now.

Comment: we are sorry to make you little bit confuse, in our report we explained “The vagina defect was not closed separately but covered with an omental flap” the meaning of the sentence is we are not closed vagina defect separately but we closed the vaginal defect with covered an omental flap
2. In their surgical technique the authors report the interposition of omentum. Yet, in the Discussion, page 7, lines 186-187 they state that there was no tissue interposition. Please explain. These contradictory statements are confusing the reader.

Comment: there are no contradictory statements. In the discussion, page 8, lines 209-201 we also report the tissue interposition

3. I agree with the reviewer #4 that the instruments in figure 3 look like robotic instruments. If this is not the case you had better use another intraoperative figure to avoid confusion, or perhaps use a figure showing the final result without the instruments.

Comment: we already use another intraoperative figure

4. There are several language errors throughout the manuscript. Some of them create significant problems like those I mentioned above. I suggest to have it checked by someone who is fluent in English.

Comment: thank you for your suggestion, we have already check by someone who is fluent in english

Thank you for your consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Dr. Prahara Yuri, SpU