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Study protocol
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Polidocanol versus hypertonic glucose for sclerotherapy treatment of reticular veins of the lower limbs: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial
Matheus Bertanha, Carlos EP Lucio Filho, Jamil VO Mariúba, Rafael EF Pimenta, Rodrigo G Jaldin, Marcone L Sobreira, Andrei Moroz, Regina Moura, Hamilton A Rollo and Winston B Yoshida

I would like to thank the reviewer for your new considerations. It could be observed that with their relevant comments, the work presents itself with better quality than the previously sent.

Detailing:

1. Editorial request: Please include all author emails on your title page.
   
   The changes were provided.

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. Statistical analysis: This section remains incomplete. How will the scores in the primary analysis (0-5) from the 2 referees be combined. Will they come to consensus first (if very discrepant) or will the mean score be used? How will these be compared across treatment groups. The analysis section lists several tests but is not very clear.
   
   We restructured this passage of the work has adjusted grounds so that there is a larger facility in the result analysis, according to its previous orientation.

   *The most important changes are highlighted in yellow throughout the text.*

2. The sample size calculation is inadequate. What is the minimal difference in the primary outcome between groups that can be detected? This is a very important consideration for a RCT.
   
   We look for aid of a statistician profesional to remake this snippet of work and we hope to have done a good job.

   *The most important changes are highlighted in yellow throughout the text.*

3. Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published.

   We redid several parts of the text trying to answer the requirements of the reviewer.