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March 12, 2009

To: Rikki Graham, PhD, Senior Assistant Editor, BMC-Series Journals
Re: MS: 1838549128234641 to BMC Pediatrics

Dear Dr. Graham,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript (MS# 1838549128234641) submitted to BMC Pediatrics. We appreciated the thoughtful and helpful comments from the reviewers. We have revised the manuscript to address each of the reviewer comments and have provided a point-by-point response. We are hopeful that our manuscript will be suitable for publication in BMC Pediatrics.

Please contact me with any questions. Thanks again for reviewing our work

Sincerely,

Adam L. Hersh
REFEREE #1

“I would like to have some area specific demographics.”

Based on this suggestion, we have added information into the methods section about laboratories, population size and prevalence of CA-MRSA in San Francisco. In terms of the question about the distribution of pediatric care between pediatricians and general practitioners, although we do not have specific data for San Francisco, pediatricians provide the majority of primary pediatric care both in San Francisco and the rest of the United States. See: Ferris TG et al. in Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 1998. We added this information into the discussion section.

“…it is stated that there are 113 general pediatricians. We lack understanding how this was reduced to 29 in the focus groups and if this could give some bias.”

We have added more detail to the methods section to make this more clear. Among those who responded to our invitation, we used purposive sampling to finalize our participants. We completed 3 focus groups including a total of 29 participants at which point content saturation was achieved. We also added a sentence in the discussion about this as a potential limitation.

“SSTI is used before it is defined on page 4 and I&D is defined three times.”

“SSTIs” is defined as skin and soft-tissue infections in the second sentence of the introduction. We have defined “I&D” as incision and drainage once in the abstract and once in the manuscript text.

“…many GPs use local antibiotics e.g. mupirocin.”

We added more to the results section about mupirocin use. In the section on medical therapy, we noted that some participants prescribe mupirocin for pustulosis in infants. In the section on prevention and follow-up, we added that many participants prescribe mupirocin for nasal decolonization.

REFEREE #2

Comment #1 and #3 Conceptual model

We have clarified that the conceptual model was developed explicitly for this study and that the model was derived based on prior research, a pilot focus group and our clinical experiences. We added a figure showing the conceptual model based on this suggestion.

Comment #2 “This sentence is probably better worded as …”
We revised this sentence according to the reviewer’s suggestion.