Author’s response to reviews

Title: Low birth weight in São Luís, northeastern Brazil: trends and associated factors

Authors:
Helma JF Veloso (helmanut@gmail.com)
Antonio AM Silva (aamouradasilva@gmail.com)
Heloísa Bettiol (hbettiol@fmrp.usp.br)
Marcelo Z Goldani (mgoldani@hcpa.ufrgs.br)
Fernando L Filho (lamyfilho@gmail.com)
Vanda M Simões (vandamfsimoes@gmail.com)
Rosângela FL Batista (rosangelaflbatista@gmail.com)
Marco A Barbieri (mabarbieri@fmrp.usp.br)

Version: 5
Date: 2 April 2014

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor:

Please find enclosed the re-revised version of our paper entitled Low birth weight in São Luís, northeastern Brazil: trends and associated factors. We changed the title to better reflect the manuscript contents.

Please note that the present version followed concerns made by the BMC Executive Editor Peter O’Donovan that mentioned overlap in the data presented in this manuscript and in another manuscript under consideration entitled “Changes in perinatal health in two birth cohorts, 1997/98 and 2010, in São Luís, Brazil - manuscript number 9114343501112551”

We argued that while the manuscript number 9114343501112551 presents data including multiples this manuscript only presents data including singletons. For the first year (1997/98) the number of cases presented in the first manuscript is 2467 and low birth weight (LBW) rate is 8.5% whereas in the second manuscript the number of studied cases is 2426 and LBW rate is much lower, 7.6%. The same applies to the second year (2010). Thus data are not comparable because of exclusions of multiples in the second paper as it is always done in papers aiming at exploring risk factors for LBW to avoid confounding by multiplicity. Thus, we are convinced that data presented in the two manuscripts although coming from the same database is not the same.

Please find below a transcription from the last email sent by the BMC Executive Editor Peter O’Donovan:

“Having read your response, and both manuscripts I would agree that the data used in both manuscripts are indeed different. I would recommend that you do mention this and explain it clearly in the cover letter of your revision so that it is easily assessed by our Associate and Section Editors”.

Please find below our point-by-point response to the reviewer’s comments. All changes performed in the manuscript are marked in yellow. Please find enclosed the other manuscript number 9114343501112551.

We hope you will find this re-revised version suitable for publication in BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth

Please let us know if you have any further questions.

Best regards

Heloisa Bettiol and co-authors