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Response to the reviewers’ comments

Dear Editor,

Please find attached the new version of our manuscript. We have read the comment of the reviewers with great interest and we thank the reviewers very much for all the suggestions. When appropriate, we have tried to incorporate them in the new version of the article.

I am enclosing an explanation of the changes introduced in the manuscript indicating where exactly the new text is to be found.

Furthermore, we would like to point out that we repeated the analysis of our manuscript using a larger sample, since the data collection is an ongoing process in our study. Please, note that the results do not involve changes in the conclusions of our manuscript and now the statistical analysis has more power.

All authors have read and approved the last version of the manuscript.

Please do not hesitate to ask us for any additional information you consider necessary.

Most cordially yours,

Ester Villalonga-Olives
REVIEWER COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author
Review of the paper:

This interesting study investigated HRQoL in immigrant children aged 3 to 5 years. To assess HRQoL, the Kiddy-KINDL was used in a short version (12 items) as self-report. Besides HRQoL other important variables were considered. The study has potential, but clearly needs revision due to usual forms of presentation and interpretation in scientific publishing and to the language.

Major revision:

The authors need to check the description in the methods and results section. More clarity is needed. Furthermore, the interpretations for the discussion are questionable at some points. The Conclusions need also revision concerning the content.

Additionally, the paper needs language editing by a native speaker with scientific background (e.g. concerning the use of articles and prepositions). Some sentences are rather long and a bit complicated. A native speaker may help rephrasing these sections. Concerning method and result sections including, more clarity is needed. The Tables need corrections leaning on conventions for scientific publishing.

Main text

Background:

2nd paragraph: the complete paragraph is not easy to follow. Could the authors please rephrase and maybe split the sentences? 3rd paragraph, 4th sentence: please replace assessment with perception.

Re: Thank you very much for these important comments. We have changed the text as the reviewer suggested.

Changes in text
(Page 3, paragraph 2)
The so-called “Latino health paradox” in the United States has been in turn ascribed to selective migration [7–10]. In other words, economic migrants constitute a healthy group of individuals who are fit to work, and often exhibit better health status than native-born individuals in spite of their socio-economic disadvantage.

(Page 4, paragraph 1)
Health related quality of life (HRQoL) is a concept which represents a person’s own perception of his or her subjective health status, functioning, and well-being in the domains of physical and psychological health, as well as social and role performance [15, 16].

**Last paragraph, 1st sentence:** I would recommend to rephrase and maybe split this sentence for a better understanding (e.g. "In Germany, % of children have migrant backgrounds. In towns, this rate was even higher ranging from 45 to 65%. However, there are no studies yet investigating HRQoL in this population. The present study..").

**Re:** Thank you very much for these important comments. We have changed the text as the reviewer suggested.

**Changes in text**
(Page 5, 1st paragraph)
In Germany, 34.84% of children between 3 to 5 years old have migrant backgrounds. In metropolitan areas, the prevalence is even higher and ranges from 45 to 65% [23]. However, there are no studies yet that have investigated the HRQoL of this population; our objective was therefore to study a sample of migrant children. We hypothesized that young migrant children would report lower HRQoL than native-born children because of the stress of dislocation as well as their disadvantaged social background. We hypothesized that HRQoL is influenced by socio-economic variables, positive development and resilience, socio-emotional and motor development, and that these will differ between migrants and native-born.

**Methods: Design:**

**5th sentence:** Please do not start sentences using numbers or write the numbers at the beginning of the sentences as words ("Ninety-six.").

**Re:** We have changed the text as the reviewer suggested.

**Changes in text**
(Page 6, first paragraph)
Participants were enrolled at the kindergartens and 96% of the parents consented to take part in the study (N=300).

**8th sentence:** I would recommend just to describe the sample, not to emphasize or value the importance of specific characteristics. "Children in the investigated sample have predominately .."

**Re:** We have changed the text as the reviewer suggested.

**Changes in text**
(Page 6, first paragraph)
Among these children, 81.35% had at least one parent coming from another country (second generation migrants).

**9th sentence:** I would think about introducing this definition maybe at the end of the background section after the aims? The phrasing seems a bit unusual to me.
Re: We have changed the text as the reviewer suggested, we have deleted the essential part, and have given details about the migrant background of the sample in a different way.

Changes in text
(Page 6, first paragraph)
Among these children, the 81.35% had at least one parent coming from another country (second generation migrants). Data collection started in May 2009 and it is still ongoing. The response rate out of the whole sample was 90.5% (N=283). The project was approved by the local ethics committee of the University Medical Center, Göttingen, Germany.

10th sentence: Could you please add the months?

Re: Thank you very much for the suggestions. We incorporated them.

Changes in text
(Page 6, first paragraph)
Data collection started in May 2009 and it is still ongoing.

Measures:

1st sentence: This is general practice and needs no specific mentioning at least not in the methods part. May be add this aspect to the aims in the background section?

Re: We have changed the text to address it.

Changes in text
(Page 5, second paragraph)
We hypothesized that HRQoL is influenced by socio-economic variables, positive development and resilience, socio-emotional and motor development, and that these will differ between migrants and native-born.

Kiddy-KINDL

First sentence: I am not sure if it is usual to introduce an abbreviation in a subtitle. Could this please be done in the 1st sentence of the paragraph instead?

Re: We have changed the text to address this comment.

Changes in text
(Page 7, KINDL section)
The Kiddy-KINDL (KK) is a validated and reliable instrument developed in Germany to measure HRQoL in children aged between 4 and 7 years [24–26].

3rd sentence: The reference for the development of the short version is missing here.

Re: Thank you for the comment. We have added the reference of the manual.
5th sentence: Please rephrase this sentence, use e.g. "Scale scores of the KK range from 0 to 100."

Changes in text
(Page 7, KINDL section)
Scale scores of the KK range from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating better HRQoL.

6th sentence: Please rephrase this sentence, e.g. "We administered the self-report version of the KK to children aged 3 to 5 years." Could you please mention here that the original version was validated for children of at least 4 years?

Re: Thank you very for these important comments. We have changed the text to address all of them.

Changes in text
(Page 7, KINDL section)
We administered the self-report version of the KK to children aged 3 to 5 years. Psychometric properties of the instrument were found to be acceptable in this sample [27]. KK was assessed by psychologists and educators using face-to-face interviews with the children.

Vienna Developmental Test

2nd sentence: Please use "In the present study."

3rd and 4th sentences: This is not quite clear, please rephrase these sentences. I assume for each scale responses of 3 items were summed up? Please add information about the handling of missing data.

Re: We appreciate this comment. Regarding the missings, the WET scales scores were calculated if children had performed seven out of the nine subtests of the scales.

Changes in text
(Page 9, last part of methodology)
In the case of WET, scores were calculated if seven out of the nine scales were responded. All other responses were coded as missing.

Last paragraph:

Please use the same structure here as in the section describing the measures. That is, please start with socio-economic data. Maybe - even better - the authors may think about replacing the sentences of this paragraph (add the into the descriptions of the measures). The last sentence with the hypothesis rather belongs to the aims (Background).

Re: Thank you very much for these comments about the structure of the manuscript. We have tried to change the article accordingly.

Changes in text
(Page 6, last paragraph)
Data on socio-economic status were collected by psychologists and educators during the interview with parents.

(Page 7, KINDL section)
The Kiddy-KINDL is a validated and reliable instrument developed in Germany to measure HRQoL in children aged between 4 and 7 years [24–26]. The recall period of the questionnaire is the past week. The short version of this questionnaire includes 12 items belonging to 6 dimensions: physical well-being, psychological well-being, self-esteem, family, friends, and everyday functioning at the kindergarten. Response categories are arranged on a 3-point Likert scale (never; sometimes; very often). Scale scores of the KK range from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating better HRQoL. We administered the self-report version of the KK to children aged 3 to 5 years. Psychometric properties of the instrument were found to be acceptable in this sample [27]. The KK was administered by psychologists and educators using face-to-face interviews with the children. The interviewers were previously trained.

(Page 8, Perik section)
We have used the scale of PERIK that measures positive development and resilience, because it has been related to the concept of HRQoL and the experience of major life events like migration; the KK does not contain this facet. PERIK was answered by the kindergarten teachers.

(Page 8, WET section)
We have used the scales socio-emotional and motor development of WET, because they have been related to the concept of HRQoL and showed a significant relationship with HRQoL in preliminary analyses [30–32]. WET was administered and tested by psychologists and educators using face-to-face interviews with parents and children.

Statistical analysis:

Subtitle: Please do not capitalize analysis 1st paragraph, 1st sentence: Please replace "on the overall whole sample" with "using the total sample" 2nd and 3rd sentences: Please rephrase this sentence, e.g. "Groups of children with migrant and native-born children were compared in HRQoL. Differences in means were tested using." Which method was used for mean difference testing? Were regressions additionally conducted?

Re: We appreciate these comments regarding punctuation, use of language in scientific articles and additional information. We have changes the text in order to better specify the methodology.

Changes in text
(Page 9, second paragraph)
Descriptive analyses were conducted stratifying by gender. Migrant and native-born children were compared with respect to HRQoL as well as the other study variables using t-tests to assess mean differences. We fit a multiple linear regression model with age, gender, positive development and resilience, socio-emotional and motor development, adjusted for socio-economic conditions and area of education. We separated migrants and native-born and investigated the relationship of these factors with HRQoL.

5th sentence: Please replace "developmental" variables. Which variables are meant exactly?

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. We have added information about it at the beginning of the section.

Changes in text
(Page 9, second paragraph)
We fit a multiple linear regression model with age, gender, positive development and resilience, socio-emotional and motor development, adjusted for socio-economic conditions and area of education. We separated migrants and native-born and investigated the relationship of these factors with HRQoL.

5th to 7th sentences: Please rephrase this section. The proceeding and the analyzed models need to be described clearer. As far as I understand by now, it was a 2step approach (?). The authors may write something like: "At first, x linear regression models investigated the effect of each variable (..) on ???" Finally, a linear regression model was analyzed."

Re: Thank you very for these important comments. We have incorporated all of them to the new text. Since we have observed that the statistical analysis was difficult to follow, we have deleted one of the steps of the analysis to avoid redundancy and we have given more details in the text.

Changes in text
(Page 9, second paragraph)
Descriptive analyses were conducted stratifying by gender. Migrant and native-born children were compared with respect to HRQoL as well as the other study variables using t-tests to assess mean differences. We fit a multiple linear regression model with age, gender, positive development and resilience, socio-emotional and motor development, adjusted for socio-economic conditions and area of education. We separated migrants and native-born and investigated the relationship of these factors with HRQoL.

Last paragraph, 1st sentence: The use of baseline data should be mentioned earlier if necessary at all in this paper? 2nd sentence: Missing data handling may be not useful in this way for calculating sumscores as far as I see.

Re: Thank you for these important comments. The part about baseline data was already introduced at the beginning of the methodology. We do point out there that we use baseline data of a follow-up study. Regarding the missings, the WET scales scores were calculated if the child had performed seven out of the nine subtests of the scale. Otherwise we had to accept the data as missings.

Changes in text
(Page 9, last part of methodology)
In the case of WET, scores were calculated if seven out of the nine scales were responded. All other responses were coded as missing.

Results and discussion:

Please create a section named results and another section named discussion. Please restructure these sections correspondingly. Limitations belong to the discussion.

Re: We appreciate the comment. We have changed the name of the sections.

1st paragraph: Please do not begin sentences with numbers or write them in words. 1st sentence: I would prefer to report the response rate in the methods section describing the study. 2nd sentence:
Please rephrase, e.g. "Genders were approximately equally distributed in the present sample (52.7% girls)."

Re: Thank you very for these comments. We have changed the wording as the reviewer suggested.

Changes in text
(Page 10, fist paragraph)
Gender was approximately equally distributed in the present sample (50.9% girls) (Table 1). The mean age in years was 4.25 (SD 0.88) for boys and 4.25 (SD 0.82) for girls. In 72% of families both parents were born outside of Germany, 9.3% had one parent born outside Germany and 18.5% had both parents born in Germany. We did not have the information of origin of 4 families that were part of the study, and who could not be classified.

Last sentence: Please mention the largest and the smallest groups.

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. We have added the information required.

Changes in text
(Page 10, first paragraph)
The largest group of children came from Asia (especially from Turkey) with 42.8% and the second largest group from Africa representing 35.2% (mostly from Ghana and Morocco); the third group was from Eastern Europe (mostly from Bosnia, Bulgaria, Russia and Albania) constituting 10.1% of the whole study population (Table 1).

2nd paragraph: Results "showed", but cannot" prove" based on this selected and small sample. 2nd sentence: Please remove "marginally" before "significant" and please use the usual interpretations due to p-values.

Re: Thank you for this revision. We have changed the text considering the suggestions.

Changes in text
(Page 11, first paragraph)
Table 4 presents the results of the multiple linear regression. Among migrants, age showed almost significant associations with HRQoL (p=0.07). By contrast, no differences were observed among migrants and native-born.

Page 11, 1st paragraph. The description is not clear. Please rephrase this section, especially 3rd to 5th sentence.

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. We have rephrased the description to make the sentences clearer than before.

Changes in text
(Page 11, first part of the discussion)
The purpose of this study was to assess HRQoL in children predominantly with a migrant background. We hypothesized that despite the possible changes in the migration regime in recent years, migrant children would report lower HRQoL because of the stress of dislocation of the family and their social background. However, we found no important differences in HRQoL scores among migrants and native-born children. If anything, migrant children seemed to report slightly higher perceived health than native-born children, and girls tended to report higher HRQoL compared to boys, especially in native-born children. Our findings differ from those reported in previous studies in which migrants have been found to report worse subjective health compared to the native-born [3, 5]. However, the differences between the instruments applied in the studies limit the comparison of the findings.
2nd paragraph: Please overdo the interpretation. Findings are "in line with " or not (2nd sentence"). 3rd sentence: Please start with "We found".

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. We have changed the text to incorporate the suggestions.

Changes in text
(Page 12, first paragraph).
We found significant differences in socio-economic status between migrants and native-born children, where migrants had lower levels. Despite these differences, findings are not in line with the results of Pantzer et al and migrants did not seem to be adversely affected [22]. We found HRQoL levels were not lower in migrant children compared to native-born children. And there were no important differences in the other variables under study between the two groups. These results seem to be different compared to previous other European studies [34, 35], but similar to studies based in the United States [36]. We suggest that the force of selective migration may have changed in recent years. Germany has been receiving skilled workers, who despite their lower socio-economic levels (compared to the native-born) report a high level of perceived health compared with previous migrants [12]. Indeed, selective migration may have become more accentuated following the 2008 economic crisis. However, this hypothesis cannot be tested with the data of our study, since data concerning duration of residence of migrants in Germany was not available. An alternative explanation of the results is based on life course trajectories of HRQoL. Our sample is based on young children and they are normally less affected by differences with peers, do not yet suffer bullying based on their migrant status, and have fewer problems adapting to a new language than older children [37, 38].

5th sentence: What is meant with "in variance with."?

Re: We appreciate this comment. The part that says “in variance with” was checked by a native English speaker, jointly with the entire manuscript, and it means it differs from. However, we changed the wording in the manuscript.

(Changes in text
Page 12, first paragraph). These results seem to be different compared to previous other European studies [34, 35], but similar to studies based in the United States [36].

Please overdo the following sentences for clarification.

Page 12, 2nd paragraph: As far as I understood there is no concrete comparison to other studies possible due to the fact that a specific short form was used and the age-group differed. This section needs to be overdone.

Re: Thank you very much for this important comment. We suggest we should give some data about previous reports for comparisons. We have clarified that we have used a short form for self-reported. Therefore there are limitations of comparability, which are mentioned in the discussion.

Changes in text
(Page 11, first part of discussion) However, we found no important differences in HRQoL scores among migrants and native-born children. If anything, migrant children seemed to report slightly higher perceived health than native-born children, and girls tended to report higher HRQoL compared to boys, especially in
native-born children. Our findings differ from those reported in previous studies in which migrants have been found to report worse subjective health compared to the native-born [3, 5]. However, the differences between the instruments applied in the studies limit the comparison of the findings.

Page 13, 3rd paragraph: Do the authors really assume representativeness of their sample? I do not think this assumption is appropriate. Representativeness should also be investigated in any study that aims it. Please overdo the complete paragraph considering scientific rules/what is usual in science.

Re: Thank you very for this comment, we have changed the part about representativeness. What we say at the end of the manuscript is that further analyses are needed to investigate this trend in larger populations and representative samples.

Changes in text
(Page 13, first paragraph)
Some limitations of the study deserve comment. Our results are based on a kindergarten-based convenience sample from a central highly populated region in Germany. However, we consider our results have internal validity for comparisons between migrant children and native-born German children, i.e. similar selection factors for enrollment in the same kindergartens.

Conclusion:

Please rephrase the sentences for more clarity and better phrasing. And please think about you conclusions again. The assumption of a different pattern is based on a comparison that may not be valid. Please overdo the Conclusions in the Abstract correspondingly.

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. We have added a reference to support our hypothesis and we have changed the parts the reviewer suggested. When we talk about the different pattern we also specify the limitations our data have, and we specify that more analyses with other samples are needed.

Changes in text
(Page 13, Conclusion)
Some limitations of the study deserve comment. Our results are based on a kindergarten-based convenience sample from a central region in Germany. However, we consider our results have internal validity for comparisons between migrant children and native-born German children, i.e. similar selection factors for enrollment in the same kindergartens.

(Page 2, Abstract)
Results suggest that HRQoL at early ages in our study exhibits a different pattern than reported previously in studies among older individuals. We attribute the discrepancy partly to a possible changing pattern of migration in Europe with more migrants capable to migrate with healthy profiles, and to the age of our population. Our findings underscore the need to study the life course trajectory of HRQoL among young immigrants and replication in representative samples.

TABLES:

Table 1: Please do not capitalize "percentage" here and please overdo the Table, e.g. Area of education, please mention in the following lines only the specific areas. And please start the Table with the main variables (migrant versus native-born; maybe the authors have an
idea of to gather migrant versus native-born in a term, something like "state of.") Table 2: Please write "Migrant" and do not capitalize "native" or the second "mean". Please format the Table, subgroups should be presented in another format than Group descriptions or maybe after a tab. The authors should consistently use one term throughout the paper. However, "native-born" and "native" is used. And please use consistently "p-value" or "significance" in your tables (see Table 4).

Table 3: Please mention the name of the measure not only "KK" and check capitalization. And do report the Total ("Overall") results not in the first, but in the last line.

Tables 4 and 5: I would highly recommend restructuring and using another format of the page. Age, gender, . Should only be mentioned once, model results could be presented in different columns.

Re: We appreciate these comments. We have changed the Tables according to the suggestions.

Changes in text
Please check all the Tables of the manuscript

Reviewer: 2

The paper describes health related quality of life (HrQoL) in 3-5 years old children and finds insignificantly higher HrQoL in migrant versus native children in spite of differences in socio-economic status. The following points should be addressed in a revision of the paper:

1. Introduction: Changes in “migration regime” as observed from the US should be linked to the situation in Europe. Please cite relevant data supporting such change in Europe.

Re Introduction: Thank you very much for this suggestion. We have added a reference to support our hypothesis.

Changes in text:

(Page 3, last paragraph)

Considering the evolving reasons for migration over time (the “migration regime”), we hypothesize that the profile of migrants may have changed, making the patterns more similar to that observed in the United States with a profile of people with low socio-economic factors but with good job skills and capable to migrate. Facts like the south-north migration, the levels of unemployment in the EU, and the good health status reported by migrants from Eastern and Mediterranean countries in some studies can be related to this phenomenon [12].

2. Methods: Please indicate the reliability of the Kiddy-KINDL in the current sample.

Re: Thank you very much for the important comments we receive. We have included
the reference of a manuscript that is currently under review elsewhere that includes the information of the reliability of the self-reported Kiddy-KINDL in 3-5 years olds.

3. Methods: Please describe the reason for including the kindergartens in one area along with a clarification of the representativeness of the sample.

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. As suggested by the other reviewer as well, we have corrected the part about the representativeness of the sample since it is true we cannot assume any representativeness since the data comes predominantly from one big German city and the study was not planned to be representative of the German population.

Changes in text
(Page 12, second paragraph)
Some limitations of the study deserve comment. Our results are based on a kindergarten-based convenience sample from a central region in Germany. However, we consider our results have internal validity for comparisons between migrant children and native-born German children, i.e. similar selection factors for enrollment in the same kindergartens.

4. Methods: Please describe how interviewers were trained and how the data collection procedure was specifically carried out (e.g. presence of parents).

Changes in text
(Page 6, second paragraph)
Interviewers were trained in person by the scientists who designed the study project and had a manual to follow the detailed instructions. The collection of data was performed using face to face interviews with children, parents and teachers, separately.

5. Methods: As regards statistical analysis please indicate why separate regression models were run, considering also the low sample size in the native children. Instead of running two models, one for migrant one for non-migrant children, one model on all children could have been run taking migration status as one of the predictors.

Re: We appreciate the comments about the separation of the regression models and we understand the reviewer concern since the sample is not large. Before the manuscript was written, we performed several analyses. And we could see that one analysis without the split of the sample was not giving all the information the analysis splitting the sample does. In other words, we could see that migrants and native-born had differences in socio-economic status and we wanted to observe the differences in both groups.

6. Methods: An important issue is the specification of the migrant background. It makes a difference whether one or two parents were born outside of the country of current residence as does the language spoken at home. Since birth place of parents seems to be available, this variable should be included in the analysis. First or second generation status has been reported to impact highly in psychosocial outcomes.

Re: Thank you very much for this important comment. The variable about the origin of the families was not included in the analysis since it was discarded in previous analyses. It was disregarded because no differences became obvious in earlier analyses.
7. Results: The abstract describes differences in quality of life between migrants and natives, yet the results indicate that there are no significant differences in line with table 2.

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. In the abstract we give the results concerning HRQoL and we specify that the differences are not statistically significant, which is in line with the text and the tables.

8. Results: Please provide in tables 4 and 5 the explained variance of the regression model.

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. We have not included the variance explained of the model since the scope of the article is to compare migrants and native-born, but not to try to identify the factors that most importantly have a relationship with HRQoL, neither to compare our model with other models.

9. Results: Please give indication of the intercorrelation of the dependent variables and explain why specific variables collected (WET, PERIK) were not included in the analyses.

Re: Thank you very much for this comment. In the text we specify that we select only those variables that have been related with HRQoL in the literature and were available in our study. We tested its previous relationship with the dependent variable in preliminary analysis, which means that there was a high intercorrelation between them (higher than 0.5).

Changes in text
(Pages 7 and 8, instruments section)
We have used the scale of PERIK that measures positive development and resilience, because it has been related to the concept of HRQoL and the experience of major life events like migration; the KK does not contain this facet. We have used the scales socio-emotional and motor development of WET, because they have been related to the concept of HRQoL and showed a significant relationship with HRQoL in preliminary analysis [30–32]. WET was administered and tested by psychologists and educators using face-to-face interviews with parents and children.

10. Concerning the tables: Please subdivide Asian origin in table 1. Does this include Turkey, and how high is the percentage?

Re Tables: Thank you very much for this important comment. We have directly changed the text to give some more information concerning the study sample.

Changes in text
(Page 10, first paragraph)
The largest group of children came from Asia (especially from Turkey) with 42.8% and the second largest group from Africa representing 35.2% (mostly from Ghana and Morocco); the third group was from Eastern Europe (mostly from Bosnia, Bulgaria, Russia and Albania) constituting 10.1% of the whole study population (Table 1).

11. The paper should be checked for style of writing. For example on page 5 the sentence “however along the paper were going to talk about migrants versus native born children to simplify” or the term “older aged” at page 10 children as well as the minor aspects of writing should be revised.

Re: We really appreciate this comment. The paper has been reviewed by a native
English speaker before its resubmission.

12. **Furthermore please explain why the area of education i.e. the specific kindergartens would be more important than the status of the family (1st generation, 2nd generation, etc...) or the origin of migrants families including this as well in the model.**

*Re: This is an important point. We have specified that the children are second generation migrants in the new text. And, as we have already mentioned, the origin of the families was not strongly related with the outcome variable. And this may probably be due to the small sample size. But we will definitely add the origin of the families in the analysis of the follow-up data. In addition, we decided to adjust for the area of education because it had an important role in our sample, and we attribute this finding to differences in these areas.***

13. **It would be preferable to separate results from the discussion section in the paper.**

*Re: We appreciate this suggestion and we have changed the text considering it.*