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Reviewer’s report:

The authors present the study protocol for an upcoming trail about PDT and PBM in lichen sclerosus patients.

Several aspects should be explained in greater detail to justify preliminary publication of the study protocol before the beginning of the trial as most information could also be included in the final publication after the trial is finished.

Please explain how you defined the sample sizes. Did you perform some kind of power analysis? What are the expected differences in the success rate of the different treatment modalities?

Please explain in greater detail the treatment process. How much of the photosensitizer has to be applied at which time before treatment? Do the patients apply the photosensitizer by themselves at home and come to the clinic later? Are they allowed to walk around with the photosensitizer or do they have to lay still?

How is the light applied? What light source is used?

Under 2.3 you refer to a pilot study that you did before however there is no reference and no further information about this pilot study. Please give the correct reference or give more information about this pilot study.

You are planning the final examination of the patients 30 days after the beginning of the treatment which will last 4 weeks. I think it would be good to include a final clinical examination of all participants after 2 or 3 months to evaluate the long-term response.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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