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Key Laboratory of the Public Health Safety, Ministry of Education
Department of Environmental Health, Room 327, Building 8
School of Public Health, Fudan University
Yi Xue Yuan Road No.138, Shanghai 200032, China

Tel: 86-21-54237203
Fax: 86-21-64045165
E-mail: wdqu@fudan.edu.cn

RE: MS. ID: 1271704671681633 entitled “Change of water consumption and its potential influential factors in Shanghai: a cross-sectional study”

Dear Prof Liang and Mr Dizon:

We'd like to thank the reviewers very much for their advice to help improve our manuscript (MS. ID: 1271704671681633). We have carefully revised our manuscript following the advice by the reviewer (see attached response letter). Our changes in the paper are highlighted in blue. We have translated our questionnaire into English and added a copy in the supplementary file.

In light of the changes, the numbers of line are different from that in our original manuscript.

Thank you very much for your assistance. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

Weidong Qu, M.D. & Ph.D.
Professor in Environmental Health
Deputy Director in Department of Environmental Health
Assistant Dean in School of Public Health, Fudan University
RE: MS. ID: 1271704671681633 entitled ‘Change of water consumption and its potential influential factors in Shanghai: a cross-sectional study’

Authors' responses to reviewers’ comments

REVIEWER #2:

1. Lines 46-48: Relations between self-reported drinking-water related diarrhoea and different water choices, diarrhoea and water hygiene treatment were investigated using chi-square test. Does the second “diarrhoea” mean self-reported drinking-water related diarrhoea? This sentence needs rewording.

-Response: Yes, the second “diarrhoea” means self-reported drinking-water related diarrhoea. Therefore, we rewrote this sentence as “Self-reported drinking-water-related diarrhoea was found correlated with different water choices and water hygiene treatment using chi-square test.”

2. Lines 55-56: The statistical symbol “P” SHOULD be italic. Please check it in the other places.

-Response: Thank you very much. We’ve corrected all the statistical symbol “P”s throughout our manuscript and the supplementary file.

3. Lines 61-62: worm ever founded in tap water affected domestic drinking water choices in urban China. Should it be better to use the term “Shanghai” instead of “urban China”?

-Response: Yes, you’re right. The term “Shanghai” is more accurate. We have changed “urban China” into “Shanghai”.

4. Lines 124-125: Thus, four categories were set as: ≤$2308, $2308.1-4615, $4615.1-7692 and above $7692. This style of writing is not good. Always, we can express this like, ≤2308, (2308-4615], (4615-7692] and >7692.

-Response: Truly thank you for your suggestion. We replaced the original writing style with yours.

5. Lines 129-131: Since most urban residents in China won’t go to work until he/she is above 18 years old. We then dichotomized education by years, ie., below 12 years and above 12 years. This is slightly confusing and need rewording. Why did the authors use the 12 as a cutoff value?
-Response: Sorry, maybe we did not express our meaning clearly. The cutoff value of “12 years” denotes the length of time they received education rather than their ages. In China, children are sent to school when they reach 6 years old. When they are 18 years old, they have received education with the time length of 12 years. Therefore, we set “12 years” as the cutoff value of education length to separate those pursuing higher education from those going to work. In the manuscript, to more clearly show our meaning, we revised the sentence as “Since most urban residents in China won’t go to work until he/she is above 18 years old and children are sent to school when they reach 6 years old. When they are 18 years old, they have received education with the time length of 12 years. We then dichotomized education by the length of the time they received education, less than 12 years and more than 12 years.” in lines 125-129.

6. Lines155-156: When expected frequency was less than 5, Fisher’s exact test was used in lieu of chi-square test. This needs some simplification. For example, when expected frequency was less than 5, Fisher’s exact test was used instead.

-Response: Thank you. We simplified the expression as your advice,

7. Lines203-205: 210 (52.50%) of the respondents thought tap water was the cleanest, sequentially came 77 (19.25%) filtrated water, 53 (13.25%) bottled water, 37 (9.25%) barrelled water and 23 (5.75%) thought “indifferent”. Were some words missed after the “23 (5.75%)”? This is unclear.

-Response: Done. We reworded the sentence as ‘210 (52.50%) of the respondents thought tap water was the cleanest, sequentially came 77 (19.25%) filtrated water, 53 (13.25%) bottled water, 37 (9.25%) barrelled water and 23 (5.75%) respondents were “indifferent” towards the type of drinking water.’