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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We greatly appreciate the reviewer’s and your efforts to carefully review the paper and the valuable suggestions offered. We have revised the manuscript according to your suggestions and highlighted the corrected parts of our manuscripts with yellow. Here are our answers to your reviewers.

Reviewer reports:
Reviewer #1:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes ν /No

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 ν /No
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:

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

Comments:
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/No

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments:

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

Comments:

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

Reviewer #2:

We greatly appreciate for the detailed review and insightful comments.

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:

None

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
   None

b. The relevant physical examination findings
   None

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.
   None

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable
   Need more emphasis and elaboration We add details about diagnostic methods, disease classification.

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits
   Needs to follow up data We revised Case Presentation section and added follow up schedule.

Comments:

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

Comments:

The discussion needs modification with the following points highlighted:

- why endometriosis happens after surgery

- what are the risks factors of developing it. Not everyone who is undergoing surgery is developing endometriosis. Why this patient developed it. Is it only by chance or other factors?

- how to prevent iatrogenic endometriosis
  We checked and revised discussion and conclusion section according to your suggestions.

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:

Yes. However some important points needs to be mentioned. We revised manuscript.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

Please see above. The article is well written. With some modifications it can be exceptional. We revised our manuscript.