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To,
The Editor-in-Chief,
BMC Pediatrics,

Subject: Submitting Revision of Manuscript: 2095093145141981 ‘Nebulised Hypertonic Saline (3%) Among Children With Mild to Moderately Severe Bronchiolitis – A Double Blind Randomized Controlled Trial.’

Respected Sir,

Most humbly and respectfully, I’d like to offer my sincere apologies for inability to submit my revision by the suggested deadline of 07/13/2015 because of my occupancy in the socio-humanitarian aspects in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake that hit Nepal.

I’m hereby submitting the revised version of the manuscript addressing all the issues as recommended by the handling editor. I’m grateful to the editorial team for their meticulous scrutiny of the manuscript that has rightfully rectified many of the small, but significant errors in the manuscript.

The revisions made have been listed as follows:

1. Editor’s comment: ‘The text is ok but the tables are a mess. You really have to go through them carefully …………………………. What is true?

   Revision: I should admit there were some typographical errors as highlighted by the editor in the tables, where there seemed to be a discrepancy in the number (n) between the text and the tables. The study was analyzed on an ‘intention-to-treat’ analysis and hence, the n=50, holds true. The previous error, n=59 as mentioned in the table 2 and 3 has been rectified to n=50.

2. Editor’s Comment: In Table-4, last column, most (but not all)
   Means………………………………………………………………………..the confidence limits could not be -0.73; -0.40.

   Rationale:
   Respected Sir, as evident in the table-4, the mean of the cohort in the columns on the left (Intervention L-Epi + 3% HS) is lower than the mean of the cohort on the right (Intervention L-Epi + 0.9% NS) with regards to Clinical Severity Scores, respiratory rates, heart rates, resulting in a negative mean difference among those variables and hence, explains the negative lower and in some, upper limits of the confidence interval. There has also been some typographical errors in the signs (±) used in some data as the editor
rightfully pointed out.

Revision:
There were also some, typographical errors in the negative signs in some of the variables [-0.73; -0.40 (0.16); which as the editor rightfully pointed as incompatible and erroneous and which should have been, -0.73; -0.40 (-0.16)] has been rightfully rectified and other errors similar to this have been rectified as well.
A new table, rectifying all such errors has been uploaded.

For the purpose of simplicity and convenience, when the same data has been analyzed, with swapping of the columns between the left and the right will result in a positive lower and upper limits of confidence intervals in most of the variables.
The revised tables have been uploaded accordingly.

3. The manuscript has been revised to adhere strictly to the guidelines of the BMC Pediatrics journal style.

I’d like to express my sincere gratefulness to the editor and the team for the meticulous examination of the manuscript as well as allowing me an extension of 1 week timeline to submit the revised version of the manuscript.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. Aayush Khanal, MD
Teaching Assistant / Attending Pediatric Intensive Care Physician
Department of Pediatrics
Tribhuvan University Teaching Hospital,
Institute of Medicine.