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Diaper dermatitis: a survey of risk factors in Thai children aged under 24 months

Dear editors,

Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript. Your comments are very valuable for improving our writing. The authors have reexamined the manuscript and made the appropriate changes. We hope that our revision will match the criteria for publication in BMC Dermatology. Our responses to editors are described as follows:

Reviewer reports:

Stefanie Ziehfreund (Reviewer 1):

Dear authors, the manuscript has been improved by the extensive revision and your methodological approach is better explained now. However, there are still some points worthy of improvement.
Methods:

1. You did a sample size calculation. Why don't you mention it in your methods? I would recommend to include this.

   Response: We do agree with the reviewer’s comments and have amended the Methods section to include the sample size calculation.

2. As I had recommended you now describe how missing data were addressed. Though, at the end of the results. However, it would go better in the methodological section or if you prefer, in the first section of the results. Moreover, "This might affect the power of the test, however, the main possible risk factors were record completely." belongs to the limitation section not to the results.

   Response: We agree and have moved the following:
   - How missing data were addressed to the Methods section.
   - "This might affect the power of the test, however, the main possible risk factors were record completely." to the Limitations paragraph.

Results:

3. In the third paragraph you describe the issue with the logistic regression performance and the different allergic diseases. The paragraph needs be shortened and in case it is relevant for you pick it up in the discussion e.g. as a perspective.

   Response: We have rephrased and shorted the sentences in the 3rd paragraph.

Discussion:

4. During your revision you changed the order of some paragraphs what leads to chronological mistakes in respect to your references. Moreover, you did not update the reference-numbers in the text after you included new literature.

   Response: The authors have rechecked and updated the reference numbers in the text.

5. Moreover, I still miss some references e.g. "This finding supports the fact that frequency of diaper changing every single time the baby has urination is important. During nighttime most
parents may not have enough attentiveness to change diaper. This can cause prolong contact time between urine and skin on the diaper area. Thus, wetness and heat can be occurred when diaper has not changed for a long time. These are the major factors that cause skin irritation." or "In addition, the application of a large amount of talcum powder to moist areas can cause skin occlusion, which leads to further irritation. Some infants also have allergic reactions to these products, as most are not fragrance-free."

Response: The authors have rechecked and added the relevant sentences and references in accordance with your comments.

6. The discussion still reads very long and has the potential to be summarized at several points e.g. when talking about the talcum powder. Additionally, the discussion is really poorly written at many points and need extensive revision, including grammar, structure and references.

Response: We summarized and shorten the sentences in discussion section. Moreover, we have sent the manuscript to our institute’s native English Research Editing staff for an intensive grammar correction.

Julia Winkler (Reviewer 2): I believe that the manuscript is now suitable for publication after some minor language corrections.

Response: We would like to thank to the reviewer for approving the publishing of this data even though some results were similar to those of previously published manuscripts.

Franz Heppt (Reviewer 3): From my point of view, the authors were able to answer all the questions, which were raised by my co-reviewers, in an appropriate way.

After the Revision, quality of the text improved.

Response: We would like to thank to the reviewer for approving the publishing of this data even though some results were similar to those of previously published manuscripts.

We hope that our revision will match the criteria for publication in BMC Dermatology.
Sincerely yours,

Leelawadee Techasatian
(Corresponding author)
Assistant Professor, Dermatology division, Pediatric Department, Faculty of Medicine, Khon Kaen university, Thailand. 40002
Email: leelawadee@kku.ac.th