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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Manuscript Revisions (MS: 1285133461457189 - Translating language and culture: A key issue in international public health research)

Please find attached our revised manuscript for the article above.

The following changes have been made in response to the referee's comments:

1. The title has been changed to International public health research involving interpreters: a case study from Bangladesh and we feel now better reflects the content of the paper. For example, both referees commented that the original title referred to culture but that this was not addressed in the original paper. We have removed the term culture from the title and it is not the main focus of this paper.

2. The paper has been re-written as a case study which has addressed many of the comments made by both referees. It has allowed key issues of working with an interpreter to be highlighted without making sweeping generalisations as commented by one referee. The strengths and limitations of a case study approach have been fully acknowledged and it is felt that the paper is now methodologically tighter than the original paper which tried to follow the format of a standard research article.

3. Both referees commented that Table 1 and other data should have been included in the results and not the discussion. We have now included this in the details of the case study.

4. The case study has allowed us to explain our reasoning for adopting the two different models for working with an interpreter and we have reflected on the advantages and disadvantages of each in our research setting.

Overall, the case study highlights the importance of considering the effect of an interpreter on the research process and findings. As such, we consider that our case study can make an important contribution to a field, which, despite its importance, has received little attention in International public health research. By re-writing as a case study we feel that we have addressed the concerns of both referees and that the paper is methodologically tighter.

We hope that you will consider the revised paper for publication in BMC Public Health and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Emma Pitchforth, Edwin van Teijlingen