

Name of journal: *World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 19454

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your comments and those from the reviewers. The following amendments have been made in the Revised Version

Editor.

All queries have been amended.

Reviewer 1.

1. "less or more"
 - a. Clarified
2. Spell PLCO and UKCTOCS
 - a. Done
3. I wonder whether these studies included tumor markers, what is the role to tumor markers in the followup-this should be commented on. Another question that poses itself, what kind of surgery is performed (laparoscopy vs laparotomy? what prompted removal in these studies? what is the duration of follow up before attempted removal? What percentage of these cysts eventually required surgery?
 - a. We provide data about CA-125.
 - b. We comment about the role if this marker
 - c. Regarding surgery we provide our opinion, but no specific recommendation can be done according data provided in the studies
 - d. We do not have answer for the reaming questions. For this reasons, we left them as unanswered questions.
4. All corrections and modifications performed by the reviewer have been incorporated in the Revised Version.
5. It would be better if the authors provide the prevalence of ovarian cysts in the general population of the menopausal women (regardless of trans-abdominal or trans-vaginal diagnostic ultrasound). Then, they explain how and why trans-abdominal and trans-vaginal ultrasound may result in different diagnosis of the cysts.
 - a. This is now explained.
- 6.

Reviewer 2.

1. Do you mean "we"?
 - a. Yes. Sorry for this
2. This is vague. Please re-write in more clear words. Thanks.
 - a. Re-written
3. Please add reference.
 - a. We provide a reference. Actually, Goldstein's reference is used.
4. With regards to the reported CI, this seems to be the Odds Ratio (or relative risk) but not the prevalence. Please revise

- a. No. This is prevalence, with 95% CI for a proportion
5. Please add reference
 - a. References added
6. According to what has been written in the next few paragraphs, I think this should be “Three studies” including Modesitt et al, Greenlee et al and Sharma et al.
 - a. Reviewer is correct. Correction made.
7. Do you mean prognosis? Please correct or clarify. Thanks
 - a. No, we mean how cysts evolved through time.
8. This is less than 50%, so it cannot be “a significant number of cases”. You may write “less than half of the women (46.1%)....”
 - a. Reviewer is right. Correction made
9. Same comment.. Not a significant number as it is a bit more than one-third of the women. Please revise.
 - a. Correct. Reworded
10. What changed in these women: Size of the cyst or its aspect/feature? Please clarify.
 - a. Clarified
11. After how long did these changes occur?
 - a. This information is not available from the studies
12. Please explain whether these cysts were removed immediately after the first diagnosis or after a waiting period
 - a. Data provided
13. 16 out of how many patients? Please add. Thanks!
 - a. Actually this is calculated from the total number of cysts.
14. What do you mean by ‘visualised’? Do you mean that 22194 women had normal scan at their first visit? Same with this sentence. The Word “visualised” is a bit vague. Please explain more. Thank you!
 - a. We meant that the ovary was identified at US scan. IN some cases with normal appearance, other times with an inclusion cysts. Reworded
15. Do you mean “an ovarian malignancy”?
 - a. Yes, sorry for this.
16. This is a very short paragraph and does not look like “comment” section. Please change the title to “Conclusion”
 - a. We agree. Reworded
17. You can add another subtitle here named “Recommendations for future research” in which you may list the limitations of your current study and make suggestions for future research.
 - a. We agree. Modifications done as suggested

Reviewer 3.

1. Interesting manuscript. To be published, after adding more information regarding the role of CA125 and RMI score. Please also add a limitation paragraph.
 - a. Data about CA-125 added
 - b. Limitation paragraph added
 - c. No single study used RMI. So, no sense to comment on this

