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The Editor  
BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth  
May 5th 2005  

Thank you for considering our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have tried to address the reviewers comments as best we can and attached a revised version of the manuscript.

Reviewer #1

Minor essential revisions

Abstract: this was changed as suggested
Results: second paragraph first sentence changed as suggested
Second paragraph fifth sentence: the reviewer is correct that this sentence does not make sense and does not add anything, so I have deleted it. 
Second paragraph seventh sentence: Table 2 was inserted there because it was at the end of the description of the results which are on a table

Reviewer # 2

Major essential revisions

4. I agree with the reviewer that the discussion and conclusions are not based on totally definitive data, but this is the information there is to date, which is what we have to work with.
5. I have added 2 more references, one published in March 2005 and one in press, May 2005 make the information the most current.
6. I have tried to improve the writing, however the reviewer did not give any suggestions on how to do this. Discussion c and d. I have the same answer as to question 4, that this research on neonatal withdrawal is ongoing and not yet definitive, however, this is what is known to date. I have added this to the manuscript. e negative results mean no proven harm
10. I have changed this to “based on epidemiologic studies to date” This is what we actually tell the women and I have addressed this in the discussion

Minor  essential revisions

7. Background. a) reference # 5 is the Health Canada Website. We also did not feel that this advisory was clear, however this was not part of our objectives in this study to make comments about it and we would let the readers make their own conclusions b) I explained in the manuscript what FDA means c) I have avoided the use of “provide/provider” , however, I did not delete it from the advisory because that was copied verbatim.
8. Results b) that is not necessarily true, sometimes we have been given the wrong numbers,
because the women do not want us calling back and are too polite to say so! c have done
9. Discussion a) I have corrected any errors that I saw b) I have rewritten the last sentence to make it clearer
11 a) No we did not ask, because it was not on our questionnaire b) the women were not asked
    why the MD’s recommended stopping the drug c) I deleted the percentages from the table.