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November 27, 2013

Emily Crow
Executive Editor, BMC Pediatrics
BioMed Central
236 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8HB
United Kingdom

Dear Emily Crow:

We thank you for your consideration and review of our manuscript entitled “Challenges to Implementation of Developmental Screening in Urban Primary Care: A Mixed Methods Study”. We would like to resubmit our edited manuscript for consideration. We have addressed the reviewer comments in the following way.

In response to reviewer 1, thank you for your comments.

In response to reviewer 2’s comments:

1. We edited page 6, line 6 to reflect that the definition of screening is “the use of brief standardize tools.”

2. We added to page 6, line 13-15 a sentence that distinguished the AAP’s definition for surveillance as a type of “unstructured surveillance” and not the “structured surveillance” that includes use of periodic screening tools as some screening experts currently define.

3. We addressed in the discussion on page 18, line 4-5 that the 65% pediatrician referral from failed screening tools “may imply a higher reliance by pediatricians on clinical
acumen and structured surveillance than on developmental screening tools, but more
study is needed to assess this assertion.”

4. To reduce the level of redundancy and verbosity, we reduced the paragraph under the
heading “Implementation Procedures” on page 9 to prevent overlap with the Results
section. The example of a satisfaction question was removed from page 10 under
methods as it can be inferred from Table 6. Additionally, on page 11-12, the introductory
sentences describing the theory of planned behavior before each theme category were
removed to be more succinct.

Lastly, Table 5 was reformatted to “Additional file 1” to meet BioMed Central’s journal style.

Again, we thank you for your consideration of our manuscript and look forward to a potential
acceptance.

Sincerely,

James P. Guevara, MD, MPH
Corresponding author