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Dear Editor,

Please find attached the results of a scoping survey of neonatal units in the UK, relating to drug use in the neonatal population. This survey provides an overview of the use of drugs use in what, from a pharmacological point of view, has often been a neglected population. It also seeks to elicit the areas of research in neonatal pharmacology that are felt by practicing clinicians to be the most important currently.

There is a large volume of data that is not able to be included in the manuscript due to space consideration, and we have offered to make this available to readers on request, however we would also be happy to make this available as supplementary material if you feel that this would help the article.

The Editorial Office asked us to make the following changes to our initial submission:

(1) Document, within the methods section of your manuscript, the name of the ethics committee which approved your study.

In accordance with guidance from the National Research Ethics Service this survey was a “service evaluation” [http://www.nres.npsa.nhs.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?alId=355](http://www.nres.npsa.nhs.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?alId=355). This survey did not need to be considered by an Ethics Committee. We have added a statement to this effect to the methods section.

(2) Provide the survey you administered in your study as a supplementary file to your submission.

We have done this.

(3) Revise the 'Acknowledgements' section of your manuscript. Please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the study by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include their source(s) of funding. Please also acknowledge anyone who contributed materials essential for the study.

We have done this.

Thank you for your help.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Turner