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Reviewer's report:

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.

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."
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