Dear editor,

Many thanks for considering our paper for publications. We admit that the paper was wanting in terms of style and structure although as most reviewers mentioned we invested a lot of time and energy conducting the study. I write to appreciate your care and the valuable comments raised by the reviewers which made us ask for the help of a competent English editor and revise the manuscript both in terms of style and rhetorical structure extensively. I hope the manuscript lives up to your high standards. Here are the somehow detailed lists of the changes made to the manuscript separated by the reviewer's comments.

Dr. Moghboeba Mosavel:

1. The manuscript was extensively edited by a competent colleague in terms of language.

2. This study is demand based (referred to in the second paragraph under Method section).

3. The process was more clearly mentioned throughout the Method section and the subsections.

4. Block refers to neighborhood.

5. The Method section was thoroughly revised.

6. “cut and paste” was removed and replaced with an explanation.

7. The language of the local periodical in which the study was reported was Persian.

8. The language issue was elaborated in the only footnote of the manuscript.
9. The discussion was revised to match the Introduction and Method sections.

10. The Method section of the abstract was revised.

Dr. Frances Butterfoss:

1. The manuscript was extensively edited by a competent colleague in terms of language.

2. The Method section was thoroughly revised.

3. The Tables are revised to be brief, more informative, and reader-friendly.

4. The problematic sections including short summary was eliminated.

5. Conclusion was revised to incorporate the basic achievements.

6. The part explaining informing people about the results was added to the end of Results.

Dr. Kathryn Braun:

1. The manuscript was extensively edited by a competent colleague in terms of language.

2. The sections of the study were totally reviewed and revised.

3. The section under primary and secondary outcome was removed and the points were built into the manuscript.

4. In terms of the committees, we had a main executive committee which we changed to Steering Committee this time and we had twelve local executive committees in the neighborhoods.

5. An explanation was added to clarify the scores of the Table 3.

Dr. Barbara L Dancy:

1. The manuscript was extensively edited by a competent colleague in terms of language.

2. The section under primary and secondary outcome was removed and the points were built into the manuscript.

3. The sections of the study were totally reviewed and revised.

Sincerely Yours,

Saeid Sadeghieh Ahari, MD
Associate professor,
Department of Community Medicine,
Ardabil University of Medical Sciences,
Ardabil, Iran