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Author’s response to reviews:

1. 9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

1. Page 2, line 56: sub serous- it is not separated word. It was revised. Page 2, Line 43

   Page 3, line 28: it should be great to describe the blood pressure, why it was only 80 mmHg. We wrote her systolic blood pressure was 80 mmHg / diastolic blood pressure was undetectable and in abstract we had written her vital signs were indicative of vasogenic shock Page 2, lines 29-30, Page 3, Line 54

   It should be better, to add sonographic images or give the reason why they were absent in this article!

   Sorry, we don’t access to the ultrasound image. Because the patient had done her ultrasound in the other center. The patient referred with a report of ultrasound that we included all data of her report of ultrasound in the study.
We change the text: The report of ultrasound examination that had already been done, revealed an intramural subserosal leiomyoma measuring 95 x 65 cm, with cystic degeneration in the fundus of the uterus. Both ovaries were normal and there was free fluid in the abdominal cavity up to Morrison’s pouch. Furthermore, a massive fluid collection of fluid with internal echoes had been seen in the pelvic cavity, suggestive of a clot. Pages:3, Lines 61-5.

3. Additional comments for the author(s)

Page 3; line 52: I would advise that you state the systolic blood pressure 80 mmHg and mention that the diastolic blood pressure was undetectable. It was revised based on this comment. We wrote diastolic blood pressure was undetectable Page 3, Line 54

Page 3; line 36-37: Did you mean 95 x 65 mm at ultrasonography? and not 95 x 65 cm and 10 x 15 cm or 100 x 150 mm at laparoscopy

Our mean is ……95 x 65 cm, with cystic degeneration…… at ultrasonography.

And

(10 x 15 cm) was found in the fundus of the uterus…. at laparoscopy

We revised the sentence to clear the concept: Laparoscopy revealed a large subserosal leiomyoma (10 x 15 cm) located in the fundus of the uterus. Page 3 Line 62 , Page 4, Line 74

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. No

The lines mentioned in the answers to reviewers’ comments are absent in the manuscript: Pages 3, 4, 5

A 38-year-old female virgin was referred to our emergency ward with right-sided abdominal pain at 11 a.m. Page 3 lines: 50-51

The patient was admitted to the gynecology ward at 2 p.m. Page 3, line 67

Her pregnancy test was negative. At 3 p.m. the patient was transferred to the operating room A diagnostic laparoscopy was performed. Page 4, line 68
The patient was discharged with no complications on the third day after the operation. At the control investigation performed two weeks after surgery, the patient was in normal condition.

Page 4, lines 79-81

Declaration section should be according to journal style. Declaration section has been provided according to journal style. Page 6, Lines 114-147