Dear Editor,

Re: 25250 - Meatoplasty: a novel technique and minireview (World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology)

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our above manuscript. We are grateful for the constructive criticism and believe its value is reflected in the revised manuscript attached. We have responded to the comments in a tabulated format as below:

Reviewer 02505493 comment	Response to comment
The present m/s focuses to the description of a new meatoplasty technique, mainly applied for cosmetic purposes. It is an interesting work, however there are several points requiring correction and/or clarification, in order it will be suitable for publication. Some of the points are as follow: Page 1, Conflict of interest: Replace "None todeclare" with **"Nothing to declare".** Page 2, lines 1-3: The sentence "In the main the technique has been used for mastoid surgery but there are no reasons precluding its use to address other causes of meatal stenosis" should replaced with **"The technique has been mainly used for mastoid surgery but it may also be used to address other causes of meatal stenosis".** Page 2, line 3: The word "conchal" has been written with a capital "i" as the end letter, instead of **"l".** Page 3, line 4: Replace "the surgeon is minded to consider" with **"the surgeon considers"**. Page 3, last line: Explain the abbreviation **"BIPP".** Page 4, line 6: Replace "god" with "**good".** Page 5, line 9: Replace "oft" with **"often".** Page 5, line 2: It is not clear what the authors want to say with the sentence "**There is an abundance of meatoplasty techniques in the literature purporting to show favourable outcomes in the author's hands".** The sentence requires rephrasing. Page 5, line 3: **Remove the words "in the main**". Page 5, line 4 from end: **The references 1 and 11 have been written by authors other than** "Korner and Siebenmann". Of course, in these references the authors used the description of the technique made by "Korner and Siebenmann", but it seems unlikely to use these references instead of the original one. Page 6, line 11: **The reference 17 cites the work of Osborne et al., and not of Patil**	Dear Reviewer, Thank you for your review and constructive criticism of our article. We have addressed the issues that you have raised regarding grammar, typos syntax. We have also addressed the referencing issues regarding Korner and Siebenmann and reference 17. We hope that you find this revised manuscript acceptable for publication. Many thanks.

et al. It is also suggested to the authors to check all references.	
Reviewer 02460553 comment	**Response to comment**
This is a very informative min-review, which is publishable. I would suggest that a separate paragraph should be added to address the clinical implication and further direction of utilizing this new methods.	Dear Reviewer, Thank you for reviewing our article. We have addressed the issues raised, as far as possible, in the conclusion of the article. We hope you find this satisfactory. One of the reasons for writing this mini-review was to add an additional approach for a meatoplasty for other surgeons to try in their own clinical work.

Thank you.

Kind regards,

The Authorship

(anonymised to allow blinded review)