

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gpm-22-17>

Reviewer A

The authors submitted a case report of a vaginal stone in an elderly woman.

Abstract: no additional comments

- *Response: Thank you*

Keywords: The keywords are well chosen.

- *Response: Thank you*

Introduction: The introduction gives a short but informative overview of the topic.

- *Response: Thank you*

The Case: The case is presented in a coherent and understandable manner.

- *Response: Thank you*

Discussion: The authors discuss the present case adequately. It would still be interesting to know whether the old surgery reports were accessible to find a possible origin of the non-absorbable suture.

- *Response: Unfortunately, the location where the patient received care prior to this specific issue was approximately 20 years ago in rural West Virginia that no longer practices OB/GYN locally by a physician who is deceased. Record acquisition, while desirable, was not attainable, sadly.*

Reviewer B

1. Introduction. Please cite reference(s) when describing the known features of this condition. I believe that 1900 issue is not needed.

- *Response: See citation 1. We do not feel that including the year here detracts from our point.*

2. Case: "A 84-year-old female". "WV" what? "anterior repair"; do you mean a surgery for prolapse (POP)? Did she had "usual" daily life, meaning NO bed rest-continuation (NO bed-bound)?

- *Response: We have specified locations (change, West Virginia, USA from original WV) and included specifics of her past surgical indications, which are extrapolated from patient-based history.*

3. Case: The stone was easily removable? I mean that the stone was not invaded/embedded into the vaginal surface?

- *Response: We have clarified findings. See change to include descriptor of*

attachment.

4. Last page; line 7, "physical"?

- *Response: unclear as to the comment relevance/point.*

5. Please reconfirm whether reference list is consistent. Page number 1223-1225 or 1223-5. If the paper consists of one page, 1223-1223. If one cannot retrieve the one on a paper basis or PubMed, please cite an internet address (http).

- *Response: Citation #9 has been added to meet this requirement.*

Reviewer C

A well-written case report in accordance with the Care reporting guidance. The patient anonymity can be further enhanced by saying "a woman in her eighties" instead of specifying the exact age.

- *Response: Thank you. We have elected to keep the patient age included, but point well-taken.*

Reviewer D

This is very well written but I don't see how this is much different than other case reports. I would direct you to the following:

Fedrigon D, Bretschneider CE, Muncy W, Stern K. Removal of Large Primary Vaginal Calculus Using the Nephroscope and Endoscopic Ultrasonic Lithotrite: A Case Report. *J Endourol Case Rep.* 2020;6(2):92-95. Published 2020 Jun 4. doi:10.1089/cren.2019.0099

This is a larger secondary vaginal calculus. Other points missing: why not order any imaging? You also need to refer to other treatment modalities which depend on the size of the stone (please see above case report). Again - nicely written and easy to read, but lacks individuality, unfortunately.

- *Response: Agreed, there are other papers in the literature, however we feel that ours has numerous unique elements. We have elaborated further on EUA findings in the Case section to describe our thinking in intentionally not getting.*