Dear Editor;

We would like to thank the reviewers for their careful consideration of our manuscript. The reviewers' thoughtful comments helped us refine the manuscript in preparation for publication. The reviewers' comments have been included below for reference with a subsequent response. Attached, please find our revised manuscript ''Laparoscopic vs. Mini-incision Open Appendectomy: A prospective study,'' for consideration as a publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology. In revised manuscript, we made some modifications in accordance with the reviewers' advices. We marked the changes in red type script in our new submitted manuscript.

Sincerely Yours,

Fatih Ciftci, Asst. Prof

e-mail: oprdrfatihciftci@gmail.com

ESPS Manuscript no:17862

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

1. Format has been updated
2. References and typesetting were corrected
3. Revision has been made according to the suggestion of the reviewer

Reviewer 1

Thank you very much for your generaous consideration about my work. I reviewed your study and really benefited from. I must confess that I did not make any consideration about the economical cost of these two techniques. Inoffically I can say that endo_loop regarding MOA is not so expensive in my institue. So LA is just approximately 15 $ more expensive than MOA

In discussion section,

I added some sentences according this point of view. Actually I did not design my study for a cost_effective analysis. Thank you again for your consideration, and giving me chance to see your work, also.

Best regards.

Answer the Peer Reviewer 2

Thank you for your detailed comments on my work. I would like to answer, and consider your comments.

1. 'The common SURGICAL reason for admission to the emergency room is acute appendicitis (AA)," I put number 1, and number 2 references for the whole paragraph. These two references are also valid for the first statement of the paragraph. In order not to cause a mislead; I corrected the references. Thank you for your consideration.
2. I also checked and added a valid reference '**its morbidity and mortality are very low" (reference?)**

Materials and Methods

1.Actually, ı did not calculate any available sample size before the study period. These patients are all the I operated two years. I wished that this size would be greater; but this is what I had.

2. 'The patients were randomized into MOA and LA groups a computer_generated number' I added this sentence in manuscript. Thank you for giving me the chance to see, and correct this deficiency.

Discussion

1. I think that pregnancy group should be evaluated in a seperate study design. That's why I excluded pregnant patients. I discussed with are sentence the last part.
2. In my city, Istanbul, most surgeons use ultrasonic energy. Of course I accept that it is not mondatory. That is our choice, only. I added a small part of discussion.

As above, reviewers comments and our responses were written clause by clause. Thank them for leading us to revise our manuscript in the World Journal of Gastroenterology. Finally thank you to give us a chance to revise our manuscript and reconsideration of our work. Please address all correspondence concerning this manuscript to me and feel free to correspond with me. We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest conveinence. With my best regards,

Fatih Ciftci, Asst. Prof