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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear editor;

On behalf of all the authors, I would like to ask you to consider our manuscript entitled” Effectiveness of a new absorbent pad on incontinence-associated dermatitis in older adult women: A cluster randomized controlled trial” for publication in BioMed Geriatrics as an original research article.

This cluster randomized controlled study evaluated our new absorbent pad for the older patients with urinary incontinence. All study participants provided informed consent, and the study design was approved by an ethics review board.

This is the first study demonstrated that the new absorbent pad for the older adults with urine incontinence might be more effective to IAD healing than usual absorbent pad. We feel that findings from this study will be of special interest to the readers of BioMed Geriatrics.

This manuscript has not been published and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. All the authors have read the manuscript and have approved this submission.

New pads were generously donated by Daio Paper Corporation, Tokyo, Japan. However, the study and writing of the article is done without any financial support by a company. The company is not informed before, during or after the study and writing of the article.

Point-by-point description of the changes
We would like to express our sincere thanks for your valuable comments and suggestions regarding our manuscript. We have read through all 3 referees’ comments and suggestions and have made the appropriate revisions. Revised portions are printed in red. And we added two authors to the revised manuscript. We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for BMC Geriatrics publication.

Following revisions have been made.

To Reviewer 1
According to your advice, we added two references (Chew A and Farage M) to general background. Moreover, we added other pad efficacy, such as Farage, et al. to introduction.

To Reviewer 2
Clarity of the generation of random sequence and the concealment
According to your advice, we added the information about the random sequence and the concealment to the methods section.
The randomization occurred at unit level to avoid contamination. The units were randomized using opaque envelopes by a researcher not involved in the study.

State that the manuscript is complying with CONSORT
According to your advice, we added the statement “The manuscript is complying with CONSORT” to the methods section.

Why cases wore the new device only during the day
We also understand that our methods did have increase the complexity of elucidating the effectiveness of the intervention. However, the allowance volume of the intervention pad was not adequate to the care regimen for changing the incontinence pad during the night in the test hospital. We added this reason to the methods and discussion section.

Did you stratify patients according to different comorbidities
It was difficult to have the diagnosed comorbidities data from all the patients at the beginning of the study because the test hospital was the long-term care facility. So we did not stratify patients
according to different comorbidities.

To Reviewer 3

**Removed from the article “new pad”**
According to your advice, we changed “new pad” to “test pad”.

**Justify why all patients were placed on the control pad at night**
We also understand that our methods did have increase the complexity of elucidating the effectiveness of the intervention. However, the allowance volume of the intervention pad was not adequate to the care regimen for changing the incontinence pad during the night in the test hospital. We added this reason to the discussion section and methods section.

**Reason why 12 patients were excluding owing to “poor medical condition”**
According to your advice, we added the further and clear explanation to Participant Flow.

**Consider the effect of prolonged exposure to moisture in greater detail.**
We do not deny the effect of prolonged to exposure to moisture for IAD healing process. According to your advice, we added excessive moisture effect to the discussion point.

**The absence of power analysis must be acknowledged in the limitations section.**
According to your advice, we added the absence of power analysis to the limitations section.

**Author contributions:** Junko Sugam had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

**The conception and design of the study:** Sugama J, Hiromi Sanada and Shigeta Y helped with the study concept and design.

**Acquisition of data:** Sugama J, Shigeta Y and Konya C helped with the acquisition of data.

**Analysis and interpretation of data:** Sugama J, Gojiro Nagkagami and Konya C helped with the analysis and interpretation of the data.

**Drafting of the article:** Sugama J helped with the drafting of the article.
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