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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thanks for your valuable assessments and contributions. We have made all the requested revisions as follows. All changes were marked with yellow colour.

Yours sincerely,

Yavuz Guler, MD

Corresponding author

(On behalf of all authors)

Revisions:

1. In title and throughout the article "TOT" should be in capitals. It needs extensive English language editing. Even the title has spelling mistake “obturator” not “obdurator”. Space between two words absent in many places throughout the article; and a lot more.
We have made all the necessary corrections and our manuscript was revised by a native English speaker.

2. After removal of misplaced TOT is it not safe to allow the urethra to heal before placing another TOT? Explain please.

Thanks for your valuable recommendations. The misplaced mesh material was traversing the bladder neck and the urethral mucosa was intact. As you have mentioned, we wouldn’t place a new sling material if urethral erosion or perforation was present. Due to these reasons, we have placed a new sling material, to achieve urinary continence.

3. Radiological descriptions should be reviewed by a radiologist, as the descriptions are not well academic.

In the manuscript, figure descriptions were revised.

Because of fact that the patient had no complaints such as hematuria, fever or lomber pain which required further evaluation, there was no need for further imaging. The patient preoperatively was assessed with ultrasonography (USG). No significant findings were detected in the USG scan.