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Dear Dr Marshall,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our abovementioned manuscript on the analysis of posaconazole as oral antifungal prophylaxis in pediatric patients under 12 years of age following allogeneic stem cell transplantation. Please find our point-by-point replies to the comments by reviewer 2 attached. We hope that the manuscript in its improved version is now acceptable for publication in *BMC Infectious Disease*.

Sincerely,

Dr. Michaela Döring
Reviewer's report

Title: Analysis of posaconazole as oral antifungal prophylaxis in pediatric patients under 12 years of age following allogeneic stem cell transplantation
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Reviewer: Andrea Page

Reviewer's report:
The authors' revisions to the manuscript have addressed the majority of the reviewers' comments and significantly clarify the patient population under study.

Some issues with style, language, and grammar persist, particularly within the newly-added text ("pharmacokinetic problem", "application of posaconazole", "up to the moment of stop antifungal prophylaxis", etc), but these are easily corrected.

Done

I would refer the authors back to comment 11 in my original review; I think the use of the term "stable" is misleading as it implies similar trough levels in individual patients over time, and it appears that the authors actually mean that patients receiving TID dosing had, as a group, "consistently higher morning trough levels" than did patients receiving BID dosing.

Done

On page 9, the authors should clarify that 8 of 60 patients were monitored for a period of less than 100 days post-HSCT. Using the range provided in the current iteration of the manuscript implies that certain patients were monitored for < 1 day, which directly contradicts the observation range provided in the sentence before.

Done

Finally, I would remove the statement in the Methods section (first sentence, page 6) that comments on exclusion of certain patients from the final analysis. The authors state in multiple other locations that all 60 patients were included in the final analysis.

Done