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The Editor in Chief,

Journal of medical case reports,

Dear Sir/Madam,

Corrected MS: 1298169965122522 - “Necrotising fasciitis- a diagnostic dilemma : Two case reports”.

Thank you for comments and suggestions I have made the relevant amendments requested by the editorial and the reviewing team. The changes have been made in review format and are available in text, within the article.

Each point is answered, and for your convenience I have also included them in this cover letter.

Editors requests

1. Study design, Sir/Madam this article contains TWO case reports, therefore with the suggested changed by the reviewer with a mild change in title I have ended it as: Two case reports “Necrotising fasciitis- a diagnostic dilemma : Two case reports”.

2. Case discussion was changed to case presentation as requested.

3. Keywords included in below abstract segments

4. Proper terms to identify gender were utilized (male/female) in the relevant areas

5. Ethnicity was included for patient no 2

6. Competing interest segmented was reformatted to meet the journal style

7. Acknowledgement segment was included

8. All images with personal information: birthdays/hospital names were blotted out

9. and images were realigned to reduce empty space in between

Reviewer 1: Vijay Malpathak

1. Images have been provided, I apologize

2. Details were added.

3. I apologize, the error has been corrected, and details regarding the legs condition were added.
4. I apologize, but the absence of any obvious manifestations unfortunately slightly delayed our diagnosis as we initially considered it a cellulitis (This was already mentioned in the discussion in initial submitted article), and the onset of bullae were rapid (12hrs), thus we do not have the preliminary images on admission.

5. The surgery was done in an urgent manner, though it would have been useful to get intraoperative photos, we were unfortunately unable to do so. I apologize.

6. I apologize, the details were included (RBS/HB). Our health care system is free, thus we have most but not all investigations. Unlike ESR, CRP is not available. (She did not have immediate family members to do it outside as well and her clinical deterioration was too rapid). This did limit the utilization of the LRINEC scoring system. But we believe clinical acumen takes precedence and in the absence of all markers should be strongly relied upon. Furthermore LRINEC scoring can be wrong even in the presence of NF. [This was added to the discussion and was referenced appropriately]

7. Changes suggested by the reviewer (abstract query 1, 2, 3) in rephrasing certain segments in the abstract were complied to as requested.

8. Changes suggested in the discussion segment in rephrasing certain segments (reviewer discussion query 1, 2, 3) were also complied.

Reviewer 2: amrinderjit kanwar

No queries

I would like to thank the reviewers for their critical and thorough appraisal and I hope the amended article meets their expectations.

Thank you,

Sincerely

Rayno Navinan