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Dear Mrs. Ambrosi,

Thank you for your invitation to submit a revised version of our manuscript.

Below we list the changes point-by-point. With these changes being implemented, we hope that the article now meets your expectations.

Yours sincerely,

H. Pickenbrock, V. Ludwig, A. Zapf

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

Zena Moore: The main point of comment that I have is that it is not clear from the description in the paper, what exactly is meant by lying in neutral, as such specific clarity around this term is
needed. In addition explanation, for the purpose of this paper, as to what is meant by conventional positioning is needed, as it is likely that this is not uniformly the same across different clinical settings.

We added information at the end of the introduction in order to clarify the principles of CON and LiN and to explain “neutral”. In addition we deleted the first image and instead added pictures of the three positions used for both CON and LiN (figure 1 and 2)

The conclusion of the paper needs greater clarity, i.e. which exact position should be tested further? (30 degree LiN?)

In the conclusion we explain more precisely how to conduct a clinical trial to compare the effects of CON and LIN on the development of decubitus ulcers.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

Maureen Elizabeth Benbow, MSc, BA, HERC: An interesting study that challenges conventional thinking. The limitations are clearly explained and the need for a clinical study highlighted.

No changes necessary.