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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We are very pleased to learn from your letter that our manuscript entitled "Lacrimal passage irrigation in children with Stevens-Johnson syndrome or toxic epidermal necrolysis: A five-year retrospective study" (Revise # BOPH-D-18-00613R1) is allowed a minor revision. Thank you for your attention for the helpful comments and advices. We have revised the manuscript according to the comments from your advice, all changes in the revised manuscript.

We would like to re-submit the manuscript and that the revision is acceptable for publication in the BOPH and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Correspondence to: Dr. Jing Fang, MD.
Point by Point response to editor and reviewer

Question #1 We note that you have included the following statement in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section of your manuscript: "Because this was a retrospective study, written informed consents were not obtained". If the need for consent was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.

Response: We have added the statement according the advice. (Please see page 14 line 284 to line 285).

Question #2 We would also like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of LP, XC, LC and QL, as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to acquisition of data or performing the lacrimal passage irrigation, alone, does not usually justify authorship.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. According to the ICMJE guidelines, to qualify as an author one should have:

a) made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; AND

b) been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
c) given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content; AND

d) agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Anyone listed as an author must be included in this section. If you choose to change your author list you will need to fill out a change in authorship form and send it by email to the Editorial office to be approved by the Editor. The form can be found here: https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies#authorship.

Anyone who contributed towards the article who does not meet the criteria for authorship can be acknowledged in the ‘Acknowledgements’ section.

Response: we have improved the statement of author contributions. (Please see page 15 line 300 to 307).

Question #3 Please remove the funding information from the Acknowledgements and include it in the Funding section instead.

Response: we have removed the funding information from the Acknowledgements to the Funding section (Please see page 15 line 295 to 296).

Question #4 In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response: we have described the role of the funding body according to your advice. (Please see "Funding" in the Declarations, see page 15 line 295 to line 297).

Question #5 At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: we have upload the revised manuscript according to your advice.