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Reviewer's report:

1 The abstract should be a summary of the findings and conclusions of a study. In my previous reviews I have commented that the abstract of this study is inaccurate, and suggested how it might be improved:

Also the abstract needs to accurately reflect this point, which currently it does not. It currently reads "At doses recommended by the manufacturers, children in the PEG-only group had higher and more regular soft stool frequency than PEG_EL". I would be content that this point was adequately addressed if this sentence read: "At the higher PEG doses recommended by the manufacturers, children in the PEG-only group had higher stool frequency than PEG-EL."

The authors have changed the previous text to read: "At the approved and tested doses children in the PEG-only group had higher and more regular soft stool frequency than PEG-EL."

I am not happy with this revision, and would strongly suggest to the editors that it is changed to the wording I previously proposed for the abstract so that it reflects the revised wording in the conclusion section which states: "The probable explanation for the better efficacy of the PEG-only formulation is that it contains a higher amount of PEG ..."

2. Page 9, last paragraph. Should read "PEG-EL when dissolved in the specified amount of water is iso-osmotic relative to plasma which therefore reduces the potential loss of water and accompanying electrolytes from plasma."

Other than for these 2 points, I am happy with the other revisions made by the authors.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.