Dear Sir,

We read with great interest the article of Naik et al. [1] entitled ‘Rapunzel Syndrome Reviewed and Redefined’. The article was aptly designed and all the current literature about Rapunzel syndrome was analyzed in detail, offering satisfactory data about the subject.

Three cases were presented in the above article and it was stated that ‘gastrostomy’ was performed in all 3 patients, however we could not understand the justification for performing ‘gastrostomy’. If the ‘gastrostomy’ procedure had been performed, we wondered how long it was used in the patients.

In the Discussion section of the article, ‘gastrostomy’ was defined as the preferred therapy model for the treatment of Rapunzel syndrome. However, in the current literature, ‘anterior gastrotomy’ is pointed out as being the preferred method of treatment for Rapunzel syndrome [2–7]. ‘Gastrostomy’ was used five times in the article, and we therefore presumed it had not been written by mistake. However, when we read the references cited in the article, which referred to the ‘gastrostomy’ procedure that had been performed, it became obvious that not ‘gastrostomy’ but the ‘gastrotomy’ procedure had been performed. In conclusion, when a foreign body exists in the stomach cavity, for its removal, not ‘gastrostomy’ but ‘gastrotomy’ is the proper therapeutic procedure.

We appreciate the interest of Narci et al. in our article ‘Rapunzel Syndrome Reviewed and Redefined’ and the point raised by them. Our aim was to review all the cases that have been published in literature, till date, and arrive at a consensus definition of the syndrome, as well as define a definite line of management.

The procedure is indeed ‘gastrotomy’ and not ‘gastrostomy’ as has been correctly pointed out by Narci et al. It was a typing error on our part and was probably an auto-correction made by our software which recognizes the term gastrostomy and not gastrotomy. We realize that it should have been corrected on manual review but it was somehow missed by us. We sincerely regret this error and thank Narci et al. as well as Professor Büchler for giving us the opportunity to correct it.
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