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Author's response to reviews:

August 25, 2006

Dear Editor,

Enclosed please find our revised manuscript entitled "Structural Equation and Log-Linear Modeling: A Comparison of Methods in the Analysis of a Study on Caregivers' Health" which we are submitting for possible publication. Please see the answers which addressed the following reviewer's comments:

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

The authors should present the chi-square and degrees of freedom for the measurement model, the final model, and the null model. The RMSR might also be helpful.

We present the results of chi-square and degrees of freedom for the measurement model as well as path model on Page 6. And also the RMSR index was added into the goodness-of-fit results.

The incremental fit indices do not show fit for the structural equation model - authors might like to comment on that.

More explanations were given for the goodness-of-fit Indices of SEM on Page 5. There exists a controversy about the criterion of incremental fit index NNFI. Clearly the closer the value is to 1.00 the better the fit. The value of above 0.90 (was acceptable) based on, though not specifically given in, Bentler& Bonett, 1980. This value was revised by Hu&Bentler (1998) to 0.95 as a start of acceptable fit. On the other hand, the NNFI might be sensitive to the sample size. There were three more references [18, 19, 20] added on Page 5.

Were the variables categorized for the LLM? This should be described and loss of information justified, perhaps with reference to previous published research which used this approach.

Yes, the categorical variables for the LLM were created on a median split from their corresponding seven latent continuous variables and two single observed variables (Page 6-7). Advantage and disadvantage of categorization were addressed on Page 6, 7 and 10. A reference was added.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Missing labels on Figures has been corrected

Figure 2 seems to imply that all latent variables were uncorrelated but this is not the case. (Adding in these
paths would make the diagram a little messy, so perhaps this could be added)

We have addressed this issue on Figure 2

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
If I were going to be pedantic, I would suggest that the umlauts be added to Joreskog and Sorbom.

-- We have Joreskog and Sorbom instead of Jorskog and Sorbom

We certify that all authors have read and approved submission of the revised manuscript and the manuscript has not been published and is not being considered for publication elsewhere in whole or in part in any language. There is no potential conflict of interest exists. The total word count for this manuscript is 5040.
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Montreal, Quebec H3T 1E2 Fax: 514-340-7564
Canada Email: bzhu@epid.jgh.mcgill.ca