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Reviewers report:

Major Complimentary Revisions:

Review of Differences in Risk Factors for Children with Special Health Care Needs (CSHCN) Receiving Needed Specialty Care by Socioeconomic Status

Abstract:

Study design: Please insert “is an” between “This” and “analysis”

Principal Findings, second sentence: This is an unclear sentence. How can you say that the 133-199% group is negatively associated with being uninsured when the income variables are not in the regression models?

Text:

Page 2, last sentence of Specialty Care paragraph: delete “among these” and replace with “in one study using data from”

Page 3, 6th line from the bottom: delete “eligibility” and next line replace “bases” with “based”.

Page 4, Study Objective paragraph, second line: replace “which” with “that” and replace “receiving” with “receipt of”.

Page 6, last paragraph: Is there any a priori reason to expect the need for these interactions in the regression models?

Page 7, 7th line of Results paragraph: Delete “were” and “as”.

Next sentence: Please rewrite as “These proportions are successively larger for each income stratum” or something like that. Please avoid use of “increasing” as it implies change and you are not measuring change, just level effects. Likewise, in the last sentence instead of “increased the likelihood” you can say “is positively associated with the likelihood”.

Next paragraph, again in the first sentence there is the phrase “as age increased, the likelihood … increased.” Please replace with “older children are more likely to have received all needed specialist care.”

The rest of the Results section is simply not readable due to the numerous
comparisons being reported and due to the interaction terms. My suggestions are to reduce the number of income categories (<200, 200+) and to eliminate the interactions. I have will email the editor an extensively marked up copy of the Results section.

Discussion section: Also suffers from trying to interpret so many findings. Also, the Discussion section does not have to cover all the regression findings. For example, on Page 13, lines 4-7 can be safely deleted.

Table 1. Please add sample size (N=) to the column headers. To save space, consider deleting the “No” rows from Yes/No variables.

Table 2: This is a crowded table. Also consider deleting “No” rows. Also for characteristics with small cell counts (like SHCIP for higher incomes), consider collapsing insurance to Public/Private/Uninsured. Please add sample size headers and also order the variables in a consistent order to Table 1 and Table 3).

Also, looking at the cell sizes and considering some of the results reported in the text, I suggest collapsing the first 2 and last 2 income categories so you only have to deal with 2 strata.

Table 3: The interaction coefficients are mostly not significant. I recommend eliminating the interaction terms from the regressions.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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