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To the editor

Dear Editor,

here is our second revision of our manuscript. Answers to the reviewer’s comments are attached to the present letter.

We also decided to modify table 2 as we think that the new version is clearer.

I hope you will appreciate our work.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Kindest regards
Giampaolo Ricci

Reviewer’s report

Title: Use of the Italian version of the Pediatric Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire in the daily practice: results of a prospective study.

Version: 2 Date: 13 January 2009

Reviewer: Isabelle PIN

Reviewer’s report:

There are still concerns about the revised version:

- data regarding distribution of asthma severity and control in the population at both surveys have been reported twice in table 2 but also in table 3
  The mentioned table was eliminated.

- the analysis of the relationships between PAQLQ and asthma control and asthma severity is now better illustrated by 2 figures showing the results of the PAQLQ according to the levels of asthma control and severity in the 2 surveys. The authors still not uses data of both surveys in a single analysis. The authors state in their answer to reviewers comments that the “results were not significant and the power limited”. This may be in favour of the lack of consistency of the results that is of concern.

  As explained in the discussion and conclusions sections, interpretation of data of asthma-related quality of life is debated and there is no consensus on the PAQLQ score correlation to lung function and to the other parameters that should be routinely monitored in the asthmatic patient. Even if results of the global analysis are not statistically significant, as explained in our previous reply to the reviewers’ comments, we think that what we found by separately analyzing PAQLQ, asthma control and asthma severity in the 2 surveys might be of some interest.

  - Regarding the analysis of the relationships between PAQLQ and respiratory function the authors performed analysis based on categorical (by quintiles, figure 3 and 4) as well as continuous (table 4) respiratory function variables. The results
do not seem to be coherent. The authors should choose which ever analysis should be shown.
We preferred to show the analysis by quintiles (figures 3 and 4) and remove the one based on continuous variables.

- The authors have added an analysis of the relationship between PAQLQ and FEV1, stratified by the evolution between both surveys (stable vs modified severity). One does not know if the authors have hypothesis why this relationship might be different in these 2 groups of children. This adds a figure 3 that is very difficult to understand…
We decided to delete this analysis and remove figure 3.
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