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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editors,

We thank you for your comments and email of 29/08/2014 and are pleased to resubmit our manuscript with suggested revisions and responses as follows:

- **Major compulsory revisions**

  Reviewer comments 1: Results, Website characteristics as predictor of content scores (p.10). The statement “...the Lagrange multiplier test was not significant meaning that over-dispersion did not occur” seems premature. With the small samples size, it’s likely to find the dispersion parameter non-significant even if data are actually over-dispersed. Phrases such as “over-dispersion may not be a concern” would be more appropriate.

  Authors’ response: In accordance with the reviewer’s suggestion, the statement ‘over-dispersion did not occur’ has been changed to ‘over-dispersion is unlikely to be a concern’.

  Reviewer comments 2. Table 4. The confidence intervals (CI) in Table 4 remain the same as in the previous version. If Pearson’s Chi-squared statistic was applied to account for over-dispersion, the CI’s ought to be wider. If the adjustment was not used, this needs be indicated. Please clarify or update.

  Authors’ response: As Pearson’s Chi-squared statistic was applied to account for over-dispersion from the outset, the initial confidence intervals reflected it’s application. In previous manuscript versions, we had not specifically outlined its use, although it had already been applied to the analysis.

  Reviewer comments 3. Results, Website characteristics as predictor of content scores (p.10). The CI in “…with UK websites reporting 88% higher scores (95% CI 26-240) than USA websites (Table 4)” is not consistent with CI in Table 4 (1.88 (1.24-2.86)). The numbers in Table 4 seem to suggest
“88% higher scores (95% CI 24-186) than USA websites.” Please verify in accordance with the response to Comment #2.

Authors’ response: A change to the text has been made in accordance with the reviewer’s observation. The phrase now reads ‘88% higher scores (95% CI 24-186) than USA websites’.

Please let us know if any further changes are required.

Thank you in anticipation.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Mairead Black
Wellcome Trust Research Fellow, Clinical Lecturer, Obstetrics and Gynaecology