

Dear Editor:

I am pleased to resubmit for publication the revised version of ESPS Manuscript NO 25941 “Laparoscopic Burch urethropexy at time of mesh sling removal: a cohort study evaluating functional outcomes and quality of life.” I appreciate the constructive criticisms of the editorial team and the reviewers. I have addressed each of their concerns as outlined below.

EDITORIAL TEAM COMMENTS:

Most of the reviewers’ concerns focused on formatting with which I have complied. I have included an audio core tip, restructured the figures and tables, and adjusted the references to fit the journal’s citation requirements. All figures and tables are now appropriately cited within the manuscript text. All supplementary files are uploaded to the submission website.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

Specific Concerns

* Some bias is concerned in this study which include: differences of the hysterectomy rate between the groups; differences of the time between surgery and post-operative questionnaire in the two groups; and the size of the sample which resulted in the conclusion being based on the trend of some data index improvement.

I agree with your assessment of the possibility of confounding results due to the differences in hysterectomy rates and interval between sling insertion and removal. I have addressed this in the Discussion section.

* Table 1 is not consistent with the description in the methods. It gives readers confused information and needs improvement.

I have revised the illustration of patient enrollment, now referred to as Figure 1.

* In abstract-instruction line 3: Stress incontinence (SUI)-stress urinary incontinence,

This sentence has been eliminated due to revisions according to the editorial team.

* References should be following the journal requirement.

This has been revised per editorial board guidelines.

Thank you,
Sarah Huber MD