

Author's response to reviews

Title: Predictors of default from follow-up care in a cervical cancer screening program using direct visual inspection in south-western Nigeria.

Authors:

Oliver C Ezechi (oezechi@yahoo.co.uk)
Karen Odberg Petterson (karen.odberg_petterson@med.lu.se)
Titilola A Gabajabiamila (titi_tag@yahoo.com)
Ifeoma E Idigbe (ifeomagenia@yahoo.com)
olutunmike Kuyoro (olutunmikekuyoro@gmail.com)
Innocent AO Ujah (innocentujah@ymail.com)
Per Olof Ostergren (per-olof.ostergren@med.lu.se)

Version:4**Date:**24 March 2014

Author's response to reviews: see over

Dr. Ezechi Oliver Chukwujekwu MD, MPH
Clinical Sciences Division
Nigerian Institute of medical Research, Yaba Lagos

Email:oezechi@yahoo.co.uk

March 24th, 2014

The Editor-in-Chief
BMC Health Services

Dear Editor,

Re-Submission of Peer reviewed Manuscript. MS4636980771029047

Default from follow up and Predictors after a positive direct visual inspection test in south western Nigeria

I am pleased to re-submit the revised manuscript of our original research article titled “Predictors of default from follow-up care in a cervical cancer screening program using direct visual inspection in south-western Nigeria.” by Ezechi Oliver Chukwujekwu, Odberg Pettersson Karen, Titilola A Gbajabiamila, Ifeoma Eugenia Idigbe, Olutunmike Kuyoro, Ujah Innocent Achaya Otobo, Ostergren Per-Olof

We have addressed all the issues raised the by the Assistant Editor.

A point by point description of changes made on the manuscript is shown below

A clean copy of the revised manuscript and figure file is hereby uploaded

Thank you for your consideration



Dr. Oliver Ezechi
Corresponding authors

Point by Point description of changes

Associate Editor's comments:

1) In the Abstract, please change the proportion concerning those women who defaulted from follow-up appointment, from 46.7% to 47.2%.

Authors Response: Noted and correction effected. 46.7% in the manuscript deleted and changed to 47.2%. See manuscript Abstract section on page 2

2) Please delete from the Discussion (p. 14, top) any study results concerning regression analyses, given that these results have already presented in the Results section.

Authors Response: Comment noted. Correction effect. See manuscript page 15, 2nd paragraph. It original read “Poorly educated women (OR: 3.3, 95% CI: 2.0-5.2) who lived more than 10 km from the clinic (OR: 2.0, 95% CI: 1.0 – 4.1) and had never screened for cervical cancer (OR: 3.5, 95% CI: 3.1 – 8.4) were found to be more likely to default from follow-up care appointment after a positive DVI test.”

Now reads” Poorly educated women, living more than 10 km from the clinic and had never screened for cervical cancer in this study were more likely to default from follow-up care appointment than their more educated counterparts , residing less than 10km from the clinic and had previously screened for cervical cancer .”

~~~~~

Please make the following formatting changes during revision of your manuscript. Ensuring that the manuscript meets the journal's manuscript structure will help to speed the production process if your manuscript is accepted for publication.

### 1. Acknowledgements

By way of a section "Acknowledgements", please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the article by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was

involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include the source(s) of funding for each author, and for the manuscript preparation. Authors must describe the role of the funding body, if any, in design, in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Please also acknowledge anyone who contributed materials essential for the study. If a language editor has made significant revision of the manuscript, we recommend that you acknowledge the editor by name, where possible.

The role of a scientific (medical) writer must be included in the acknowledgements section, including their source(s) of funding. We suggest wording such as 'We thank Jane Doe who provided medical writing services on behalf of XYZ Pharmaceuticals Ltd.'

Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements section.

**Authors response: Comment Noted. Acknowledgement section added. See Page 17, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. It read “**Acknowledgement**  
We sincerely thank Mrs. Eva Amadi and Mrs Rita Nwosu for their assistance during recruitment, data and sample collection and Mr. Oba Rasheed for his assistance during data entry and analysis.”**

## **Funding**

OCE's research budget at NIMR.

## 2. Figures

We note that the figures have been included in the manuscript file. Please upload the figures as separate figure files using the "upload" form on the submission system only, and delete the figure from the manuscript file. The figure file should

not include the title (e.g. Figure 1... etc.) or the figure number. The legend and title should be part of the manuscript file, given after the reference list. Please ensure that the order in which your figures are cited is the same as the order in which they are provided. Every figure must be cited in the text, using Arabic numerals. Please do not use ranges when listing figures. For more information, see the instructions for authors: <http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/fora/figures>.

**Authors response. Comment noted. Correction effected. Figure removed from manuscript, leaving only legend and title of figure and upload as figure file**