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Author's response to reviews:

Dear BioMed Central Editorial Team

Thank you for the peer review comments on our manuscript “Parenthood, information and support on the internet. A literature review of research on parents and professionals online”. We appreciated the comments and found them interesting and helpful in our work to improve the article.

However, the two reviewers made very different assessment of the article as one found it “most interesting and useful” and suggested only a few minor adjustments while the other suggested more extensive revisions. We believe that this situation is partly due to different scientific traditions.

Nevertheless we have considered the comments and made the following changes:

• We have clarified the purpose of the study at the end of the introduction
• We have restructured the method section by adding new sub-headings. In this section we have also added a new introduction to clarify that this is not a meta-analysis or a fully, systematic review but instead a scope review
• We have reformulated one of the research questions
• We have clarified the differences between an earlier article in this project and this article. We have also added the reference to this article in the text
• We have added missing references, clarified indistinct sentences, corrected misspellings and improved the language in the whole article

A few comments, though, were left without any measures. There are two major reasons for this. Firstly we believe that some of the comments can be related to a misunderstanding where one of the reviewers regards our study as a meta-analysis and asks for a special section for “Assessment of studies”. We have now clarified in the method section that we have done a scope review and therefore we do not discuss the quality of the included studies. We also believe that comments like “please avoid terms like rarely, the vast majority etc without information on effective and corresponding percentage” are irrelevant. We
focus on the content of the studies and not the quantitative aspects. Further, we are convinced that the suggestion to “add tables and flow charts” will not contribute to a better understanding. Instead we refer to a previous article of ours where some of these detailed aspects were focused.

Finally it is also suggested that the initial and contextual text under each subheadings should be removed as it is not any “results”. We are aware of this but think instead that these few sentences under each subheadings increase the readability of the article.

We have tried to follow the standard for literature reviews in BMC Family Practice by looking at other, similar articles in the journal (see for example Williams et al., 2008). We hope the editorial team are pleased with our improvements of the article and finds it being on the same high level of standards as other literature reviews in the journal.

Sincerely

Kristian Daneback and Lars Plantin