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Author’s response to reviews:

Quito, August 19 2018

Dear Editor,

We are very grateful for the opportunity you gave us to publish the results of the work entitled “Exploratory study of the reproducibility of the SCore for INtrinsic and EXtrinsic skin Aging (SCINEXA) scale in “Ruta Escondida de la Mitad del Mundo”, Ecuador, 2017.

We thank also the time and effort of the reviewers to make this paper of better quality. We made our best to follow your suggestions.

Next, you will find changes made to the manuscript.
Editor comments

Response

Has your study shown any significant difference in the result of test regarding skin phototype? In other words, did skin phototype have effect on the reliability of the test-retest in your study?

Sample size was too small to make this kind of analysis.

Define ex-smoker vs. smoker for smoking status, and unemployed and other for occupational status.

We define ex-smoker an adult who has smoked at least 100 cigarettes in his or her lifetime but who had quit smoking at the time of interview.

Unemployment was defined as people who do not have a job, have actively looked for work in the past four weeks, and are currently available for work. “Other” as category comprised those retired people or having informal jobs

In Table-2 please notify that the

Sun exposure was evaluated in daily way.

How do you justify differences in SCINEXA Indices in 3 time points?

It was a mistake, we changed to correct figures.

Reviewer 1

Response

Please consider deleting the sentence in BACKGROUND:

" i.e., a population that has little or no resemblance to the population of Ecuador."

Deleted

Reviewer 2

Response

Please make a clear distinction throughout the manuscript between Reproducibility and reliability
It is the same term, we replaced reliability by reproducibility

Language revision is needed before acceptance. For example in page p 7, line 27 "then" should be replaced by "than"

This term was changed. A certificate of English language revision is provided

It is not apprehensible for this reviewer the use of Anova test for ordinal data.

We are comparing three means which can be analized with ANOVA techniques

Please clarify the objective to test different proportions in the sample with Fisher test

Fisher’s exact test is more accurate than the chi-square test or G–test of independence when the expected numbers are small.

Please report standard deviation in Table 3

Already reported

Table 4 is not intelligible. Please modify the title and explain the results with more detail in the text. Why is there a markedly higher number of patients with a score lower than 2 at 4 days retest, in comparison with baseline?

We changed the title of this table.

It was a mistake, we changed the numbers

The authors state that the SCINEXA this scale is useful for the population living in Equador. However, the authors only report the test-retest reliability and thus conclusions about the applicability of the scale for a given population are not supported

We eliminated the phrase “and this scale is useful for the population living in this area”.