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Noumea, New Caledonia, January 15th, 2013,

Dear editor of BMC Public Health,

We are pleased to resubmit our manuscript “Determinants of adherence to secondary prophylaxis of acute rheumatic fever recurrence on the island of Lifou (New Caledonia): a retrospective cohort study”

All contributing authors have read and approved the submission of this revised manuscript. This manuscript has not been and will not be submitted for publication elsewhere.

In revising the manuscript we have taken into account both comments. Our responses are presented in red inserted underneath each comment and modifications were made in the manuscript.

We hope that the editorial board will accept our modifications and will consider this new version.

Sincerely yours,

Eric D’Ortenzio on behalf of the authors
Reviewer comments and responses:

Reviewer 1

The authors have addressed my comments adequately. Based on the revised manuscript and previous comments of the other reviewer I have some minor essential revisions:

1. Include the provided information about the pilot-testing of the questionnaire in the paper.
   We added: “The questionnaire went through a pilot phase for 10 persons.”

2. Provide two decimal places for presenting the odds ratios.
   We corrected odds ratios.

3. The paper still has English language issues that should be addressed.
   The paper has been reviewed and corrected by an English speaking person.

Reviewer 2

There are still some problems with written English but it is much better and I am sure it will be able to be dealt with at the editorial level.

All minor points except for (22):

1) line 64 - change to "protective against"
   We corrected the sentence

2) line 73 - not sure what "ARF referent" means (referent is not a term I have come across before relating to ARF). This needs to be re-written.
   We corrected the sentence

3) line 113 - 'consists in' should be 'consists of'
   We corrected the sentence

4) line 127-128 - this sentence does not make sense: 'adherence is a dynamic and evolutive process which rates can range from 0 to more than 100%'
   We corrected the sentence

5) line 140 - the tense of this sentence needs to be changed: 'In the Pacific region we HAVE found the highest prevalence rates of RHD in the world'
   We corrected the sentence

6) line 140 - delete the word "rate" because prevalence is cross-sectional, not a time related figure
   We corrected the sentence

7) line 142 - change 'and' to 'but': year of primary school [23] BUT there are no data relating to the level of adherence
   We corrected the sentence
8) line 147 - Add s to ethic: Ethics Statement
   We corrected the sentence

9) line 159-60 - sentence needs fixing: Population comprises 96% of Melanesian
   We corrected the sentence

10) line 162: delete "all" - mostly water and electricity...
    We corrected the sentence

11) line 165: change referent to a better term - "ARF referent"
    We corrected the sentence

12) line 169-171: this sentence does not make sense: "Cardiologist's consultation, echography, electrocardiogram and transportation to the cardiologist are free of charge when a full medical coverage cost is effective."
    We corrected the sentence

13) line 190 - 'unique interviewer' should be 'single interviewer'
    We corrected the sentence

14) line 191 - this does not make sense: "For children in age to understand but < 16 years old"
    We corrected the sentence

15) line 195-198: - please re-write this sentence and use the term patient recall and not "memorization" or "memories"
    We corrected the sentence

16) line 207: change to value - Variables with a two-sided p value
    We corrected the sentence

17) line 240 - the term "have a full medical coverage cost" does not make sense and needs to be fixed
    We corrected the sentence

18) line 251-2 - where was the study done by by Eissa et al (please include location).
    In a remote Top End Aboriginal community. We corrected the sentence

19) line 267: "large siblings of children" - please re-write
    We corrected the sentence

20) line 268: "but populations were not comparable with our" - please re-write so this makes sense
    We corrected the sentence

21) line 269: what does "large sibling" mean??? Do the authors mean "large number of siblings" perhaps?
    We corrected the sentence
22) line 278-94: this whole section is a bit confusing. Clarification required.
   We clarified this section

22a) line 284-6 - please re-write.
   We clarified this section

23) line 287 - please delete the "'s" in cardiologist's
   We corrected the sentence

24) line 306 - single, not unique
   We corrected the sentence

25) line 311 - does "interrupt" mean "cease"???
   We corrected the sentence

26) line 312 - replace "his" with "its"
   We corrected the sentence

27) line 324 - replace the term "ARF referent"
   We corrected the sentence

28) line 327 - delete "so"
   We corrected the sentence

29) line 329 - what does this phrase mean? "is probably a most appropriate" - please re-write.
   We corrected the sentence: “But the key point to improve adherence among Melanesian patients is probably a more appropriate information regarding the disease and the treatment, taking into account the Melanesian perceptions of the disease.”