Reviewer's report

Title: A survey on knowledge and self-reported formula handling practices of parents and child care workers in Palermo, Italy

Version: 3 Date: 25 August 2009

Reviewer: Madeleine Sigman-Grant

Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
NONE

- Minor Essential Revisions
First, I would like to thank the authors for their attention to the previous comments from all the reviewers. They are to be commended for improving both the content and the English. This submission is a great improvement.

Abstract
1. Background- Sentence one: change ‘poorly diffuse within’ to “diffused among”
2. Conclusions Sentence 2: Remove ‘to’ between ‘answering’ and ‘the questions’
3. Conclusions Sentence 3: change ‘not feasible’ to ‘unfeasible’

Background (page 3)
1. Second paragraph: Can the authors provide any evidence regarding the demographic information of the children under one year of age where foodborne illness is the highest. This would be valuable information and justify their recommendations that low-income families are to be targeted with the necessary information regarding PIF.

Methods (page 5)
1. Second sentence: change ‘to the study’ to ‘in the study’
2. Change ‘compiling’ to ‘completing’
3. Insert ‘to’ between pertaining and food safety

Methods (page 6)
1. The last sentence in the top paragraph beginning with ‘eligibility criteria’ is very confusing. Are the authors trying to state that they used individuals who did not reflect the characteristics of the target population (because the entire population was to be used) but rather were experts? This measures content validity of the questionnaire and is acceptable.

Results
1. In several places throughout this section, the authors repeat details that are also found in the Table (e.g. line 3 of first paragraph). These statements are not
necessary and could be removed.

2. Page 10 – last paragraph: remove ‘class’ after age and change ‘both groups’ to ‘either group’

Discussion

1. Page 10; third sentence, paragraph one: change ‘need of to ‘need for’
2. Page 11; second line: change ‘evidences’ to ‘evidence’
3. Page 11, line 8: change ‘showed’ to ‘reported’
4. Page 11, line 14: change ‘pose’ to ‘put’
5. Page 11, line 20: change ‘answering to the’ to ‘answering’

Conclusions

1. In order to justify why parents of lower levels of education are particular target groups for information dissemination, the authors should provide some evidence that this is needed. Especially since they have already stated in their discussion that lower education groups were reported to be associated with safer food handling behaviors. Are rates of infection higher in PIF-fed low income children than in children from higher educated parents? From both the authors results and reports in the literature, higher educated families may be less vigilant about food safety issues than lower educated families. This reviewer would be satisfied if the authors would change the sentence: “The public and, in particular, parents with lower levels of education should be informed…” to “The public should be informed…”

- Discretionary Revisions

It would be easier for the readers if Table 2 was reconstructed into a format similar to this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean Score (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent CCW Parent CCW Parent CCW Parent CCW Parent CCW Parent CCW Parent CCW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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