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Reviewer’s report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: NO

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

   a. The relevant patient information, including:

      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
      - Main symptoms of the patient
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

   b. The relevant physical examination findings

   c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider
including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:

- Diagnostic methods
- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: NO

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: YES

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: YES

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: NO

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

The authors have resubmitted their manuscript which reports the case of a vesicovaginal fistula (VVF), which was treated with a laparoscopic transabdominal approach.

After review I have the following comments:

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.

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.

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.

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.
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