

Dear Dr.Ma,

Thank you very much for your decision letter and advice on our manuscript entitled “**Abdominal Hemorrhage After Peritoneal Dialysis Catheter Insertion: A Rare Reason for Luteal Rupture**”. We also thank the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions. We have revised the manuscript carefully, and all the revisions have been marked in red in the manuscript. In addition, our point-by-point responses to the comments are listed below this letter.

This revised manuscript has been edited and proofread by Luzhou Jiayi Language service Co.,Ltd.

We hope that our revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in your journal and we look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Santao Ou

First of all, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to the reviewers for their constructive and positive comments.

Replies to Reviewers

1. In the title, it is not sure which is better between luteal rupture or luteal cyst rupture. And, it is informative to add pre-operative CT scan photo about luteal cysts if authors had CT examination before replacement of PD- catheter.

Response: Thank you for your insightful suggestion. We didn't find signs of luteal cyst in the abdominal CT scan, or during the exploratory laparotomy either. Since we could not confirm that the luteal cyst had formed, we hold that luteal rupture is more appropriate.

2. In line 70 of the "Case presentation", authors just mentioned "She had suffered from thrombocytopenia". However, authors do not describe the reason and/or diagnosis of thrombocytopenia. Please add the information.

Response: The patient reported that She had suffered from thrombocytopenia for more than 10 years, but she refused bone marrow biopsy and the specific reason was unknown. she received conservative therapy, and her platelet level was maintained at approximately $70 \times 10^9/L$. This point has been briefly mentioned in the Case presentation of the revised manuscript (Page 4, Lines 78-81).

3. In line72, it is unsure that "Her last period was 10 days before surgery". It would be better to clarify what means.

Response: Thank you for your insightful suggestion. Her last menstrual period was on June 29, 2019, 10 days before peritoneal catheter insertion. This point has been briefly mentioned in the case presentation of the revised manuscript (Page 4, Lines 84-85).

4. In lines 71 and 77, it may be better to change from "didn't give her special treatment" to "conservative therapy".

Response: Thanks for your thoughtful suggestion. This sentence has been revised as suggested in the Case presentation of the revised manuscript (Page 4, Lines 80).

5. I cannot find “Supplemental Figure 1” Therefore, I could not evaluate it.

Response: Supplemental Figure 1 has been uploaded with the revised manuscript.

6. In the “Discussion”, authors about disorder of coagulation systems. However, I am doubting if their presented data might not enough in the present case.

Response: Thanks for raising this critical issue. We added some descriptions about disorder of coagulation systems. This point has been added in the discussion of the revised manuscript (Page 7, Lines 160-163), and Reference 7, 8 has been added to the revised manuscript.

In addition, we modified the part of Case presentation according to Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision Case Report.