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Dear Editor-in-Chief:

Re: Manuscript 9213588704094178

Determining the impact of medical co-morbidity on subjective and objective cognitive performance in an inner city memory disorders clinic: a retrospective review

Thanks very much to both you and the reviewers for the excellent feedback on the article. I will attempt to address each reviewer’s concerns in turn:

With respect to the comments from the editor in chief:

(1) Although you have provided more information within the background section of the abstract of your study, this does not constitute what we mean by context information. Please see http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/10/743/abstract for an example of what we are requesting and provide this information before the stated aims of your study.

Thanks for pointing this out. We have now added further information to the background in keeping with the suggestion from the editor-in-chief describing how our study contributes uniquely to the literature. This can be found in the background section of the abstract, page 2.

Please also highlight (with 'tracked changes'/coloured/underlines/highlighted text) all changes made when revising the manuscript to make it easier for the Editors to give you a prompt decision on your manuscript.

In keeping with the editor-in-chief’s suggestion we have highlighted all of our current changes using track changes.

Ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style (http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals). It is important that your files are correctly formatted.

Our article conforms to the style as laid out by the journal.

With respect to comments from reviewer number 1:

The description of the statistical methods is not sufficient. Which programme was used? Do the authors really mean Spearman, or is it Pearson, particularly for the partial correlation?

Thanks very much for pointing this out. I consulted with our statistician and he used SAS version 9.2. This has been added to the methods section, first paragraph, page 8 as well as some information about p values, etc. He also confirmed that we did in fact use the Spearman correlation considering our non-normal data and the ordinal property of most of our variables for correlation analyses. The additional analysis was to partial out the effect of age (or control for the effect of age).
Thanks very much to the editor in chief and reviewers for your helpful comments. Please let us know if anything requires further clarification. I have saved the manuscript changes using track changes so they should be easy to identify.

Sincerely,

Corinne Fischer MD FRCPC
Director of the St. Michael’s Hospital Memory Clinic