Response to Reviewers' comments

Dear Editor,

We thank you for your careful consideration of our manuscript. We appreciate your response and overall positive initial feedback and made modifications to improve the manuscript. After carefully reviewing the comments made by the Reviewers, we have modified the manuscript to improve the presentation of our results and their discussion, therefore providing a complete context for the research that may be of interest to your readers.

We hope that you will find the revised paper suitable for publication, and we look forward to contributing to your journal. Please do not hesitate to contact us with other questions or concerns regarding the manuscript.

Best regards,
Reviewer 1

**Comment 1:** Title of the study seems insufficient.

**Response:** We thank the Reviewer for the comment. Proposed new title is “Predictive risk scales for Development of Pressure Ulcers in Pediatric Patients Admitted to General Ward and Intensive Care Unit”

**Comment 2:** Abstract can be made better summarizing the study. ‘Intervene’ keyword is not required.

**Response:** We thank the Reviewer for the comment. The manuscript has been amended according to your suggestion.

**Comment 3:** Discussion can be improved by adding details comparing this present study with other published data. The authors have studied the predictable factors for development of pressure ulcers in paediatric patients admitted in ward and ICU. They have compared three different scales and presented their opinion. The study seems relevant and could be of value to the readers. although not new but it signifies the role of these scales in predicting a debilitating condition. As suggested by the authors too, this requires a large scale multicentric study to give definite results and recommendations.

**Response:** We thank the Reviewer for the comment. This study, based on the results obtained in pediatric general ward or ICU, initially aimed to reflect the differences in pressure ulcers associated risk factors, and to identify more suitable pressure ulcer evaluation scale for the pediatric population with following evaluation of its performance in PICU. Although, PICU group was still too small, this topic is of a interest for authors, and we are planning to further explore it in the next studies. Discussion section has been amended in order to make results and future prospects clearer.
Other issues

Comment 1: The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Response: We thank the Reviewer for the comment. Approved grant application form is added to the list of documents.

Comment 2: The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for the comment. All pictures are prepared according to your description and added to the documents list.

Comment 3: The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for the comment. The corresponding section was added after the main text and before the references list.