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Dear Dr Puebla,

RE: MS 1002890308165070, Use of a cancer registry is preferable to a direct-to-community approach for recruitment to a cohort study of wellbeing in women newly diagnosed with invasive breast cancer

We were very pleased to receive your recent correspondence informing us of provisional approval for the publication of our revised manuscript in BMC Cancer.

We thank the reviewers for their comments about the manuscript. Reviewer 1 (Santosh K Chaturvedi) specified their acceptance of the manuscript without further revision. Reviewer 2 (Ann M Geiger) suggested that the manuscript be checked for minor grammatical errors (minor essential revision); this was done and a few changes have been made. Notably, the spelling of ‘enrollment’ has been changed, as requested (despite the fact that the alternative spelling ‘enrolment’ is also correct). Also, reviewer 2 made a (discretionary revision) comment that we might have been harsh in our self-criticism concerning bias in our recruitment process, in light of the fact that our data suggests a fairly representative sample. We thank the reviewer for appreciating the difficulty of recruiting a representative sample, however we feel that it is not necessary to change the manner in which we explained possible biases in our sample. We feel that it is better to clearly outline potential drawbacks with regard to our recruitment methods even if recruitment appears to have been successful.

With regard to the removal of Prof Graham Giles from the revised manuscript author list, this was done following his request to have his name removed. He felt that he did not have sufficient time to take part in the revision of the manuscript following the receipt of the reviewers’ comments in February 2008 and was not comfortable being named as an author. Prof Giles has written to you directly to confirm that he asked to have his name removed from this manuscript. However, we are grateful for his contribution to date and so have included him in the Acknowledgements section. Also, following further review of the BMC Cancer policy regarding authorship, we felt that it was appropriate to remove Melisa Bagnato and Julie deCrespigny from the author list as their contribution was restricted solely to recruitment to the study. MB and JDC did not take part in the drafting and review of this manuscript. Both MB and JDC agreed to this change. They are now listed in the Acknowledgement section.

Finally, the type of consent sought from participants and specific author contributions were also clarified and the order of sections within the manuscript was corrected.

We trust that the manuscript now fully complies with the requirements of the journal.

Regards,

Dr Marijana Lijovic