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“Pediatric gastroenteritis in the emergency department: Practice evaluation in Belgium, France, The Netherlands and Switzerland”

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed our point-by-point replies to the comments by the reviewers.

We hope you will find this manuscript suitable for publication in the Biomed Central Pediatrics and look forward to hearing from you in that respect.

Sincerely,

Dr Angoulvant
**Point by point:**

1. Title page: Please include the email addresses of all authors on the title page. Please ensure that it is the same with the one entered on the submission system.
   
   • Done

2. Competing Interests: Please be advised that manuscripts must include a ?Competing interests? section. This should be placed after the Conclusions/Abbreviations. If there are none to declare, please include the statement ?The authors declare that they have no competing interests.? 
   
   • Done

3. Authors' Contributions: For manuscripts with more than one author, all BMC Series journals require an Authors' Contributions section to be placed after the Competing Interests section.
   
   • Done

4. Ethical statement: Please provide in your methods section, a statement on ethical approval for the study. If ethical approval was not obtained then please state this together with the reason why approval was not needed
   
   • Done. The following sentence was added in the method section : ”Approval from the Ethics committee was not needed because this study is reflective of opinions more than actual practice and no real patients were included. “