

REPLY TO REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

Reviewer's code: 00646460

In this paper, the authors described a modified skin bridge technique for ilio-inguinal lymph node dissection. The operative technique is clearly presented, and the clinical outcome and possible complications were discussed. In general, the article is well-written, and the information contained within is clinically relevant and useful.

Sir, we are thankful to your kind comments.

Reviewer's code: 00504156

The manuscript is suitable for publication.

Sir, we are thankful to your kind comments.

Editorial comments

Sir, we have revised the manuscripts as per your suggestions.

Reply to chief editors' comments:

This is concise, well written paper describing a modified surgical methodology for ilio-inguinal lymph node dissection. This editor-in-chief generally agrees with the comments from the two reviewers, but still would like to suggest a few revisions as listed below.

- 1) Merge the primary and secondary subtitles, “OPERATIVE TECHNIQUE” and “Modified skin bridge technique”, into one subtitle “OPERATIVE TECHNIQUE OF MODIFIED SKIN BRIDGE”.**

Sir, the same has been modified.

- 2) Use the past tense of the verbs in all sentences in the above-mentioned section.**

Sir, the same has been modified

- 3) Create a new section subtitled as “RESULTS” or “OUTCOMES”, taking the first paragraph of DISCUSSION section and the later part of the above-mentioned section as the contents.**

A new section “result” has been added in the revised manuscript.

- 4) In the DISCUSSION section, indicate what are the differences between the earlier [ref 2] and your recent modified “skin bridge techniques” for ilio-inguinal lymph node dissection, and what are the limitations or potential drawbacks of your new technique.**

Sir, the modifications have been added in the manuscript.