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PDF covering letter
Sophy McHugh  
Assistant Editor  
BMC Journals  
Re: Measurement of Illumination Exposure in Postpartum Women  
BMC Psychiatry  

Dear Ms. McHugh:

Thank you for the very kind and helpful review of our manuscript #1927486935130612, “Measurement of Illumination Exposure in Postpartum Women.” We have addressed the reviewer’s comments in the form of a revised manuscript.

As Dr. Kasper recommended, we have added a further description of the purpose of cosine fitting (page 8, 2nd paragraph, lines 4-9): “For example, if some subjects removed the recorder for bathing in the morning and others bathed at night, the simple means would be biased by the time-of-day missing data. The logarithmic transform was used both because the biological response may be approximately related to the logarithm of illumination intensity and because the distribution of lux measurements was highly skewed (both within-subjects and between subjects).”

Page 12, 1st paragraph, line 8 (now page 13, 1st paragraph, line 9): “optimal amounts of light; postpartum status”. We have accepted and reworded the phrase to be “optimal amounts of light; however, postpartum status”

Page 5, 2nd paragraph, line 1: “low levels of light exposure was not necessarily”. We have accepted and change the phrase to be “low levels of light exposure were not necessarily.”

Page 7, 1st paragraph, line 7 (now page 7, 1st paragraph, line 8): “signed an IRB”. We have expanded the abbreviation to be “signed an Institutional Review Board…”

We have added the t-values of the statistical tests in the results section, as recommended (page 10, 4th paragraph, line 2).

Page 9, 1st paragraph, line 8 (now page 10, 1st paragraph, line 9): “None specifically reported symptoms” has been changed to “None of the subjects specifically reported symptoms.”

Page 9, 3rd paragraph, line 3 (now page 10, 4th paragraph, line 3): “0.85, it is not quite clear, what is meant by that.” We have recomputed and further explained the power test.
“There was 80% power to distinguish the mean log$_{10}$[lux] of the control group from a mean of 0.81 or less among postpartum women (one-tailed t-test, alpha = 0.05).”

Page 11, 2nd paragraph, line 7 (now page 12, 2nd paragraph, line 7): “without sacrificing her exposure to the environment of light that” has been changed to “without sacrificing her exposure to light that”.

“Competing interests: none declared” has been changed to “None declared.”

We appreciate the reviewer’s comments and have used his recommendations for clarification and rewording of the text. We hope you will be happy with the attached revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Emily J. Wang
Department of Psychiatry
University of California, San Diego 0667
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, California 92093-0667