

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Laparoscopic umbilical trocar port site endometriosis: A rare case report and literature review" (ID: 52237). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as following:

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

1. Response to comment: The section reporting the case presentation is needlessly containin subheadings. Some clinical details are not needed (etc: patient's arterial pressure or general findings).

Response: according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision and the Format for Manuscript Revision for my specific manuscript type: 'Case Report'. This Case Presentation section must be written in a structured format following these guidelines: Chief complaints ;History of present illness; History of past illness; Physical examination; Laboratory testing; etc. So we set up the subheadings according to the guidelines. And we read the Manuscript over and over, removing unnecessary clinical datas such as patient's vital signs, insignificant ultrasound data.

2. Response to comment: we could figure out some novel findings including patient caharacteristics, pre, intra or post operative findings which may increase or decrease the tendency for port site endometriosis.

Response: In the discussion section of the manuscript, we have described and summarized the pathogenesis、clinical caharacteristics、differential diagnosis、diagnosis、treatment and prognosis of the disease in paragraphs. The umbilical trocar port site where the camera is placed was not the cannula incision from which the specimen was taken out of, why is there an incision endometriosis? We think endometrial cells are planted by gloves or stitches which contaminated with endometrial cells during the suture. This view is rarely mentioned and is a detail worth pondering. And we mentioned how to reduce the occurrence of AWE at the end of the manuscript.

3. Response to comment: Conclusion of a journal article should be based on the findings of the article and should not exceed a few sentences.

Response: It is really true as Reviewer suggested . We have re-written this part according to the Reviewer's suggestion.

Reviewer #2 and Reviewer #3:

Response to comment: suggested minor language polishing.

Response: Special thanks to you for your good comments. We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript.

We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our paper.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Wei Xiong

Corresponding author:

Name: Wei Xiong

E-mail: axsj1113@163.com