Subject: Submission of revised manuscript ID: cosmetics-206358.

Dear Madam, dear Sir,

You will find below the answers to your comments regarding our manuscript (ID: cosmetics-206358 - Minor revisions) “Improving skin hydration and age-related symptoms by oral administration of wheat glucosylceramides and digalactosyl diglycerides: a human clinical study” by Valérie Bizot, Enza Cestone, Angela Michelotti and Vincenzo Nobile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWER Comments</th>
<th>Valérie BIZOT Answers</th>
<th>Reference in the manuscript revised version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Sample size:</td>
<td>We do agree that our study is not a confirmatory study indeed we have modified the different sections in the manuscript accordingly.</td>
<td>Lines 17 and 27 in the Abstract. Lines 150 and 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the response is mentioned, that priori sample size calculations are based on statistical tests that are later not used. The opposite is the case. You must exactly conduct the statistical analysis as planned before because it is a summed model for this study. Because this has not been done here please describe this transparently. Consequently this was not a confirmatory study. Please adjust your discussion and interpretation accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Regarding on products:</td>
<td>Yes the way it was written was not clear. This section was modified in the manuscript: “Additional, exclusion criteria were pregnancy or intention to become pregnant, lactation, food allergy/intolerance, and participation in another similar study within the last 2 months prior enrollment in the present study, using products containing moisturizing and/or anti-aging active ingredients taken orally or applied topically”. Finally, all subjects were asked not to change their lifestyle, toilets and dietary habits. Indeed, subjects unable/unwilling</td>
<td>Line 119-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I totally agree that you cannot remove leave-on products during a trial in subjects with dry skin. However, now there is a problem now in the eligibility criteria. Here you say that subjects were excluded when “using topical products containing moisturizing ... ingredients”. This is a contradiction. Does this mean that all subjects started treating their skin when starting the trial? This makes no sense.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWER Comments</td>
<td>Valérie BIZOT Answers</td>
<td>Reference in the manuscript revised version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to comply with protocol requirements <em>(including accordance not to use any other cosmetic product than the basal cream given at the beginning of the study)</em> were not included in the study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on “results” section

(2) Again, do not compare baseline values with a statistical test. Remove this from the text. A test does not indicate an “unbiased randomization” or the “absence of covariates”.

This section was modified accordingly. In addition, overall intra group differences were suppressed from the tables.

Lines 267-270
Lines 293-309-329

(3) Results:
Please correct carefully the verbs describing the changes. I think TEWL, roughness etc. decreased in the intervention groups...

This section was carefully red again and modifications were made.

Lines 275-341

(6) Results:
Please provide SDs as spread estimates around your numbers. SEMs are only appropriate indicating mean differences (see CONSORT).

This section was modified and data are provided with SD. The text in the Results was modified accordingly.

Lines 272-341
Lines 276-277 and 317-320

Comments on “Discussion” section

(5) Please add limitations:
Having 20 subjects per group is no limitation per se. Limitations are that is was not confirmatory, that there might be an interaction between the topical and the oral products, you have done a high number of statistical tests inflating the overall alpha error etc...
Please say this in the text.

Study limitations were added in the conclusion.

Lines 423-429

Because many revisions were made, concerning English language, MDPI English Editing Service will accept to revise the manuscript again if it is accepted and if reviewers and/or editor consider that English language is an issue.

I remain at your entire disposal for any additional questions and I am wishing you a good reception.

Looking forward for your answer,

Yours faithfully,

Valérie BIZOT- Ph,D Biochemistry