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To,
The Editor,
BMC Public Health

Subject: - Re-submission of manuscript for publication in BMC Public Health

Sir/Madam,

Please find enclosed our manuscript entitled, ‘Developing and implementing an Accreditation system for Health Promoting Schools in Northern India: A cross-sectional study’ which we would like to resubmit for publication as a research article in journal, ‘BMC Public Health’. We confirm that this manuscript has not been published elsewhere and is not under consideration by another journal. All authors have approved the manuscript and agree with its submission to **BMC Public Health**.

The research area in which the authors have worked relates to a new area of school health and need of the time and this innovation needs to be in notice of the policy makers, health and education professionals as well as the general population as early as possible. All this could be possible if you kindly consider this research paper for publication. It is requested to waive off the publication fees (if any) because of low income country status of India and meager resources.

We have prepared this paper according to the norms of this journal. But if any alterations/editions are required, kindly intimate us or do it at your own end. Thanking you in anticipation. We look forward to hearing from you at the earliest convenience

Yours sincerely,

**Corresponding Author,**
Dr. J.S. Thakur, MD
Additional Professor,
School of Public Health,
Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research
Chandigarh.
Mobile: 9463602173, Email Id: jsthakur64@gmail.com
Revisions in the manuscript

1. The methods require much more focus on what actually happened- how was the literature and document review done, how many discussions and with whom the accreditation process was formed, who was at the workshop and who did they represent?
   Reply: The review of literature on health promoting schools and its framework was done for a reference period of last 10 years (2001-2011). The process of accreditation has been added in the form of Table 2. The milestones of development and implementation of accreditation process have been summarized in the table.

2. Given, the relatively small amount of schools (17) how many of them, number not just percentages, needs to be reported in the methods, plus this is an opportunity to drill down into some of the similarities differences between the actual schools- which can be done based on demographics, student make up, staff make up and other contextual influences while keeping anonymity of each school.
   Reply: The number of schools has been added in brackets along with the percentages given in the results section. The details of schools have been added as Table 1.

3. There is no mention of ethical approval.
   Reply: The ethical approval has been taken from the Institute’s ethics committee. It has been mentioned in the methods section.

4. There is no discussion section.
   Reply: Earlier, discussion section was a part of results section. Now, discussion section has been separated and added in the manuscript.