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Author's covering letter for initial submission

Title: The development of chronic cough in children following presentation to a tertiary paediatric emergency department with acute respiratory illness: Study protocol for a prospective cohort study

Authors:

Version: 1 Date: 20 June 2013

Comments: see over
06 May 2013

To the Editorial Board of BMC Pediatrics and Niamh Redmond,

Re: Submission of revised manuscript for “Chronic respiratory disease amongst children presenting to a tertiary paediatric emergency department with acute respiratory illness: study protocol”

In writing this letter I would like to resubmit the above mentioned study protocol for publication with BMC Pediatrics and to address the comments provided by Niamh Redmond following her second review. Firstly I would like to thank BMC Pediatrics for considering our protocol for publication and Niamh for her feedback. I believe all comments have been adequately addressed.

Please find attached with this application the revised manuscript, cited figures and an electronic copy of the paper based case report form for publication.

Please refer to the below point-by-point response to concerns as raised Niamh with direct reference to the relevant sections of the revised manuscript (attached).

On behalf of the all the authors I would like to thank you for considering this application and I look forward to your response. Please do not hesitate to contact me via email (k.ogrady@uq.edu.au) or by phone (+61 7 3636 1296).

Regards,

Dr Kerry-Ann O’Grady
BNSc GDipPH MAppEpid PhD
Written responses to peer review comments

Reviewer: Niamh Redmond

Comment 1:

“Abstract: The study/design methods section does not mention any data analysis. One or two sentences summarizing the proposed analysis would be helpful.”

Response:

The abstract now includes a summary of the proposed data analysis. The following has been added to the Methods section of the abstract:

“Primary analysis will be the proportion of children with persistent cough at day 28(±3). Multivariate analyses will be performed to evaluate variables independently associated with chronic cough at day 28(±3).”

Comment 2:

“Background: iParagraph 4, last sentence: This does not read well to me and I think this could be rephrased. Also the words ‘over looked’ should be all one word (overlooked). iiParagraph 7, last sentence: I think the words at risk should read ‘at-risk’.”

Response:

1This sentence has been revised and ‘over looked’ reduced to one word. Now reads:

“Furthermore, there are no data detailing the types of ARIs that children present with in which a pre-existing chronic cough may be overlooked.”

2The words at risk have been hyphenated (“at-risk”)

Comment 3:

“Recruitment: Second paragraph, first line: I think there are two ‘and’s here, one of which should be deleted.”

Response:

The second ‘and’ has been removed.
Comment 4:

“References: There are some inconsistencies with the referencing:

1 Reference 2 – this does not state the year.

2 Reference 4 – this looks incorrect to me (but I may be wrong!) – Please check journal formatting guidelines

3 Reference 16 – incomplete reference.

4 Reference 30 – last author’s surname is current with a small ‘l’ – should this be a capital L?”

Response:

1 The year has been added. Reference 2 now appears as:


2 Unrequired notations have been removed. Reference 4 now appears as:


3 The online version of this article has been published before inclusion in an issue. Reference 16 now appears as:


4 The authors name begins with a capital “i”. The font used makes the capital “i” appear as a lower case “L”. Reference 30 has remained unchanged.

I would again like to take this opportunity to that the peer reviewers for their feedback, comments and critique.