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**Rebuttal letter:**

The authors would like to thank the editorial office and the reviewer for their comments. In the following all comments will be addressed.

**Comment:**

References was not corrected cited in the text and beginning at the first sentence by reference 47???

**Answer:**

The references have been sorted alphabetically, we apologize for this error and have now listed the references in the order of appearance.

**Comment:**

Concerning laparoscopic surgery for ulcerative colitis and IPAA (for three step procedure, in order to reported IBD emergency surgery) you could cited comparative study ouaissi M et al J Am Coll Surg. 2006, ouaissi Surg Laparosc Endosc Percutan Tech. 2008.

**Answer:**

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, the studies have been included into our manuscript.

**Comment:**

Concerning lapararoscopy, results of this review reported low length of stay, blood transfusion, complications rate. Complicated cases of penetrating disease careful selection of patients together with a high level of laparoscopic expertise seems to be the main influencing factor for good short and long term outcomes. Studies investigating the best population that would benefit most by laparoscopic approaches are still missing. Limitations of comparative studies so far might have been a potential selection bias within the different groups. Problem of comparative studies was often two heterogenous population….. This idea was more developed in order to clarify manuscript.

**Answer:**

The authors absolutely agree with the reviewer. These limitations have already been addressed in the manuscript.

**Comment:**

Concerning new technics The sentence about HALS was not clear, and conclusion about this was so confusing.

**Answer:**

The Paragraph of HALS has been revised.

**Comment:**

Paper need to have tables with different studies.

**Answer:**

A table has been added to summarize current evidence and highlight included studies.