Author's response to reviews

Title: Variations in chemoprophylaxis for meningococcal disease: a retrospective case note review, analysis of routine prescribing data and questionnaire of general practitioners

Authors:

   Peter J Marks (peter.marks@nottingham.ac.uk)
   Keith R Neal (keith.neal@nottingham.ac.uk)

Version: 5 Date: 30 Oct 2001

PDF covering letter
Dear Sir

Variations in chemoprophylaxis for meningococcal disease: a retrospective case note review, analysis of routine prescribing data and questionnaire of general practitioners

Thank you for your email of 9th October 2001. We now submit a revised manuscript, taking into account your reviewers comments.

Karen Roos comments:

We have added recommendations and changed the Discussion section so that it does not begin with the study limitations.

Dr Anna Gilmore's comments:

1. All these points have been added to the Methods section.
2. We have clarified as suggested.
3. We have given further information on the questionnaires.
4. This has been included in the Methods section.
5. This has been referenced (although it was previously referenced under Methods).
6. We have added information on comparisons between CCDC and other public health doctors and discussed possible bias in the Discussion.
7. We have added information to support the view that prescribing for gonorrhoea is unlikely to have affected the results significantly.
8. We have added information to clarify these points.
9. We have included further information about socio-economic deprivation.
10. The issue of out-of-hours prescribing is incorrectly stated by your reviewer. Prescriptions written by the out of hours co-operative are attributed in PACT to the practice where the patient is registered, not to the doctor writing the prescription.
11. As point 10.
12. All the practices are computerised. However, assessing effective use of the computer is more difficult!
13. Figure 1 has been removed and the information incorporated in the text.
15. See point 7. Also included in Discussion.
16. Further discussion of this point added.
17. Information about socio-economic deprivation has been included.
18. This point has been included in the Discussion, but see point 10 above.
19. Recommendations have been included.

We hope we have addressed the reviewers comments to your satisfaction, and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Dr Peter Marks
Lecturer in Public Health

Dr Keith Neal
Senior Lecturer in Communicable Disease Control