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Dear Editors-in-Chief,

Thank for your review of our manuscript entitled “Comparison of three different dressings for partial thickness burns in children: study protocol for a randomised controlled trial” by Emma Gee Kee et al. The required revisions to the manuscript have been made in the form of track changes. Please see the authors’ responses to the reviewer questions below:

**Question 1: In the Data Analysis section, they say that the “data will be analysed as intention to treat and on a per protocol basis.” Which of these is the primary approach?**

**Response:** All data will be analysed as intention to treat and on a per protocol basis, with the intention to treat analysis being the primary approach for this trial. (Please see manuscript revision, page 15).

**Question 2: Also, how will missing data be handled (particularly in the intention to treat analysis)?**

**Response:** Any missing data will be handled using the multiple imputation method. (Please see manuscript revision, page 15).

N.B. Additionally, errors were observed and corrected in the reference list of the manuscript by the authors. Therefore, please use the updated manuscript attached if accepted for publication.

I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Yours sincerely,

Emma Gee Kee