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September 17\textsuperscript{th}, 2014  
Re: Second Revision  

To \textit{BMC Editorial Board}  

Please accept the revisions to the attached manuscript titled “Disparities in obesity among rural and urban residents in a health disparate region”. We have made the final requested changes from the reviewers and provide the details in the attached response document.

The research presented in this manuscript represents original work that has not been submitted to any other peer-review journal. Each author assumed a unique role in the development and execution of the project and contributed to the writing and critical review of this manuscript. We are excited about the potential to disseminate our research findings through \textit{BMC PH}. Please feel free to contact me at (540)-231-5104 or hilljl@vt.edu if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

Jennie L. Hill, PhD \textbf{(Corresponding Author)}  
Assistant Professor  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Human Nutrition, Foods and Exercise  
Blacksburg, VA 24060  
540-231-5104  
hilljl@vt.edu
Response Document
Revision #2

Title: Disparities in obesity among rural and urban residents in a health disparate region.

We have made the suggested revision from the reviewers. We would like to thank the reviewers for their time and the helpful suggestions for this manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer #1 Comments</th>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The authors have satisfactorily addressed the issues I raised in my initial review of their manuscript, with one exception: The authors state: &quot;all census tracts in the 3 counties are classified as rural with RUCA codes &gt;4.&quot; Then the very next statement is &quot;A handful of census tracts have RUCA scores of 2 or 3, designating very sparsely populated areas.&quot; These two statements seem contradictory – how can all census tracts have RUCA codes &gt; 4 if some have RUCA codes of 2 or 3?</td>
<td>We have revised the sentence and it now correctly reads: Using the USDA Rural Urban Community Area Codes (RUCAs), all census tracts in the 3 counties are classified as rural with RUCA codes &gt;4.[29]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>