

Author's response to reviews

Title: Statistical estimates of absenteeism attributable to seasonal and pandemic influenza from the Canadian Labour Force Survey

Authors:

Dena L Schanzer (dena.schanzer@phac-aspc.gc.ca)
Hui Zheng (hui.zheng@phac-aspc.gc.ca)
Jason Gilmore (Jason.Gilmore@statcan.gc.ca)

Version: 3 **Date:** 18 February 2011

Author's response to reviews: see over

Ref: MS: 1233077791451727

Statistical estimates of absenteeism attributable to seasonal and pandemic influenza from the Canadian Labour Force Survey

Dena L Schanzer, Hui Zheng and Jason Gilmore

18 February, 2011

Dear Dr Marianne A.B. van der Sande, Ms Roxane Rajabi
Editors, BioMed Central

On behalf of my co-authors, I would like to thank you for your expressed interest in our manuscript and especially the reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions concerning our manuscript. All minor essential revisions suggested by reviewer #1 were addressed and the journal style guidelines were reviewed. The changes have been highlighted using the track changes option. The responses have also been outlined below.

Yours sincerely,

Dena Schanzer
Corresponding author
Public Health Agency of Canada

Reviewer's report

Title: Statistical estimates of absenteeism attributable to seasonal and pandemic influenza from the Canadian Labour Force Survey

Version: 2 Date: 7 February 2011

Reviewer: Jeff C Kwong

Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed all of my main concerns. I have only a few additional minor comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None.

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Abstract: Line 41: Suggest adding comma between “influenza” and “accounting.” Missing “of” (should be “loss of 0.2%”)

Corrected.

2. Methods: Data Sources: I know I asked for more information about the LFS, but I think the authors may have overdone it a bit. At the least, the contents of this paragraph could be more concisely stated.

The description of the LFS has been condensed.

3. Methods: Line 106: “the way” should be “a way”

Corrected.

4. Methods: Line 189: should be “lose” rather than “loose”

Corrected.

5. Results: Line 286: “due to”

Corrected.

6. Results: last paragraph: this paragraph contains both interpretation and speculation that probably don't belong in the Results section

The sentence was moved to the discussion section.

7. Discussion: Line 356: missing “season” after 2005/06

Corrected.

8. Figure 3 caption: Line 509: remove comma

Corrected.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

None.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.