Author’s response to reviews

Title: Risk factors for nasal malignancies in German men - The South-German Nasal Cancer Study

Authors:

Eberhard M Greiser (eberhard.greiser@arcor.de)
Karin H Greiser (h.greiser@dkfz-heidelberg.de)
Wolfgang Ahrens (ahrens@bips.uni-bremen.de)
Rudolf Hagen (hagen_r@mail.uni-wuerzburg.de)
Roland Laszig (roland.laszig@uniklinik-freiburg.de)
Heinz Maier (mail@prof-heinz-maier.de)
Bernhard Schick (hno.chefsekretariat@uks.eu)
Hans Peter Zenner (hans-peter.zenner@med.uni-tuebingen.de)

Version: 3 Date: 21 October 2012

Author’s response to reviews: see over
Re: MS 1315774931721954
Manuscript 2. Revision
Risk factors for nasal malignancies in German men – The South German Nasal Cancer Study

Dear Mr. de Jesus,

Thank you for your patience.

I would like to address the remarks by the two reviewers as follows:

1. Reviewer Wolfgang Hoffmann:
   1.1 Number of cases who received printed questionnaires has been inserted.
   1.2 P 8 results section, line 7: deletion done.
   1.3 P 8, line 10: 2 controls who were identified as cases were included as such, after histopathologic findings were provided by respective hospitals.
   1.4 Table 3 and Table 9: corrections made according to suggestions of reviewer.

2. Reviewer Steve Wing:
   2.1 Argument 1: Indeed we have reasons to believe that with increasing levels of response the proportion of less educated persons with below average income, a higher proportion of being jobless, smokers, overweight, as we did during the 1st German National Health Examination Survey (1984-1985) intermediate analyses of respondents with increasing response rates. I included an explanatory statement into the manuscript. During the conduct of the 1st National Health Examination Survey I was Chairman of the German Cardiovascular Prevention Study with the responsibility of quality control of the study. The National Health Examination Survey provided reference data for 6 study regions where community-based intervention programs took place and intervention effects were monitored, conducting regional health examination surveys.
   2.2 Argument 2: The analysis provided in table 9 is a logical consequence of Argument 1, demonstrating that indeed ORs are larger in the stratum with least educational attainment.
   2.3 Minor comments: errors have been corrected.
I sincerely hope that these revisions of the manuscript satisfy both of the

Eberhard Greiser, MD, PhD