Dear reviewers,

Thank you for reviewing our Letter “DIABRISK-SL trial: further consideration of age and impact of imputations”. Below we have outlined our responses to your comments:

- Reviewer #1: Nothing that the authors have said is incorrect.
  Response: Thank you for your review.
Reviewer #2: This correspondence article provides critique and suggestions for further reporting and analysis on a previously published manuscript from Wijesuriya et al [1]. In general, this reviewer agrees with many of the points the authors make. Specifically, given the wide age range in the original study by Wijesuriya et al [1], I concur with the suggestion for further information and analysis stratified by age-group. In addition, I agree that LOCF is not the best available imputation method, with MI being preferred. Overall, the comments/suggestions provided by Gkioni et al would improve the quality and transparency of reporting in the article by Wijesuriya et al [1].

Comment 1 Page 2, Line 83
Typographical error - the age range of participants is reported as 6-40 (in the abstract) and 5-40 in the following section. Upon review of Wijesuriya et al, I see that the age range is also reported as 5-50 in the abstract, and 6-40 in the abstract and Table 1. Since part of this correspondence recommends re-analysis based on age differentiation, I suggest the authors clarify the age range with Wijesuriya et al for accurate reporting.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We noticed the different classification of age groups; the protocol reports that participants aged 5-40 are eligible for inclusion, so does the methods in the results paper. The age of 6 appears because as we can see in Table 1 with the baseline characteristics, they never randomised any child 5 years old. The youngest was 6 years old. Therefore, in our manuscript, we changed the age range to 6-40 instead of 5-40 years old, in the “Age differentiation” section, page2, line 28.

Comment 2 Page 3, Line 31-32
Typographical error: BOCF or MI? - Is this sentence supposed to read: "The BOCF and LOCF methods resulted in similar differences between the treatment and placebo, while the MI method introduces greater uncertainty, which is a more realistic scenario."

Response: Thank you for your comment. We understand that the sentence could be misleading so we decided to rephrase it. We replaced this sentence with the following one “While MI and LOCF methods in this study resulted in similar between-group differences about the treatment and the placebo, this is probably because of the LOCF introducing the same bias for both treatment groups. However, analysis using LOCF assumes the imputed value is known thereby overestimating precision.” in page 3, third paragraph, lines 31-35.

Reviewer #3: I agree with the authors, the comments they make are constructive and lead towards the production of a more robust evidence based research study.

Response: Thank you for your review.

Thank you for your time reading these revisions based on your suggestions.

Yours sincerely,

Efstathia Gkioni