

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Vaginal enterocele after cystectomy: A case report and review of literature" (ID: 72191). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

1. Response to comment: (1-7)

Response: Thank you very much for your approval of our manuscript.

2. Response to comment: (8. The table data needs to be checked again and the text corrected, because is defined several times "YSE" instead of YES.)

Response: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing ,We have examined the tables data and revised the questions. Thank you for your advices.

### 3. Response to comment: (9-14.)

Response: Thank you for your approval of our manuscript again we delete the Biostatistics and prepared the manuscripts according to CARE Checklist (2016) - Case report and CARE Checklist. Thank you for your advices.

### Reviewer #2:

#### 1. Response to comment:

First of all,thank you very much for your approval of our manuscript.We have omit the same phrases in the abstract-case summary and try to make it brief. In addition, because of the inflammation, adhesions and pain all contribute to increased local tissue oxidative stress in patients.And oxidative stress (OS) as one of the principal factors associated with mesh foreign-body reaction.So we did not place meshes to prevent the aggravation of inflammation. We newly added explanations about not placing mesh in the manuscript and relevant references were cited for corroboration. Thank you for your advices.