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Dear Ms Neilan

Re: MS: 1206477940459104 Infant skin-cleansing product versus water: A pilot randomized, assessor-blinded controlled trial

Thank you for reviewing our resubmitted manuscript.

We have reviewed each of the reviewers’ comments and made appropriate changes; these are highlighted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referee comments</th>
<th>Amendments/response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referee 1: No revisions requested</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referee 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In &quot;Intervention&quot;: the composition of the tested detergent is not declared yet, as required. In particular, I believe it is necessary to specify the names of the chemicals in INCI, instead of the generic description of the product given by the authors. The reader can draw his own conclusions about the quality of the product from the composition. The numerical values of the &quot;Table 2&quot; are still partially out of alignment from “4 weeks post”</td>
<td>More detail has been included, as requested (highlighted on page 8) In my version, the values are aligned. I have, however, tried to reformat them, so hope this transfers correctly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We look forward to hearing from you

Yours Sincerely
Professor Tina Lavender