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20th December 2007

Dear Dr Lolu da-Silva

MS:  1566674585154405
Towards socially inclusive research: an evaluation of telephone questionnaire administration in a multilingual population
Elizabeth Dormandy, Katrina Brown, Erin P Reid and Theresa M Marteau

Thank you for considering the amendments to this paper for BMC Medical Research Methodology. We are grateful to you and the reviewers once more for their time and helpful comments. We have revised the paper as outlined below. The page numbers refer to the clean copy:

Reviewer Tim Allison
Minor essential revisions:
Change the word “telephone” to “direct contact” on page 4.
This has been done

Reviewer Ann M Geiger
Minor Essential Revisions:
Classification of women by language.
We agree there was a lack of consistency in the terms used. We have revised the terms such that on page six we describe “Women who agreed to be contacted by the research team were contacted in a language identified by the GP as the woman’s preferred language, using a telephone interpreter if appropriate, and informed about the trial.” and on page eight “Women were classified by their GP into these groups, based on whether the woman required an interpreter to speak to a member of the research team. In such cases the GP indicated the woman’s preferred language.”

Cost Information:
We thank the reviewer for identifying that the paper appeared to suggest that the costs were not based on hard data. This was not the case. They were based on measurements taken during this study. We have now described more fully how the costs were obtained in the methods section on page nine. On pages ten to 11 of the results section we have described more clearly the precise costs. We agree with the reviewer that it would be helpful to include more on costs in the abstract and we have added the following sentence: “Compared with postal administration the additional costs associated with telephone administration were £3.90 per questionnaire for English speakers and £71.60 per questionnaire for non English speakers.”
**Discretionary revisions**
We agree with the reviewer and have added a figure (Figure One, page 23) describing the differences in results by questionnaire administration method

Thank you for the opportunity to revise this paper and we look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth Dormandy  Katrina Brown  Erin Reid  Theresa Marteau