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April 20, 2006

The Editor
BMC Public Health

Re: Manuscript ID 1438657617884574

Dear Sir or Madam,

Attached is a second revision (3rd version) of the manuscript entitled 'Assessing effects of a media campaign on HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention in Nigeria: results from the VISION project'. This work represents original research and has not been submitted for publication elsewhere. All authors have participated in the drafting, editing, and revision of this manuscript, and approved the final version.

Following this letter is a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments, as well as the two requests made by the BMC Editorial Team. We look forward to a final decision on this manuscript; we appreciate the consideration.

Regards,

Joseph Keating
Research Assistant Professor
Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine
1440 Canal Street, Suite 2200
New Orleans, LA, 70112

Title: Assessing effects of a media campaign on HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention in Nigeria: results from the VISION Project evaluation
Reviewer 2: Lalit Dandona

Response to comments:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. We agree that the differences observed in the outcome variables are important to report. We have modified the 3rd paragraph of the discussion to briefly discuss the differences between outcome variables, and added a conclusion section that highlights the importance of differences between 2002 and 2004 in outcome variables. As well, we have inserted a sentence into the Abstract to also highlight the small differences between 2002 and 2004 outcome variables.

   a) A sentence has been added to the methods section: Second sentence under Data Analysis section reads "Comparisons of the outcome variables were made between the baseline 2002 data and the follow-up 2004 data."

   b) The third paragraph in the Discussion section now has a sentence that reads "Although the overall differences between the 2002 baseline data and the 2004 follow-up data in the three outcome indicators are small...." See response to comment 1 above. However, given that the differences were small, and we did not analyze the data to determine why these differences were small, we have refrained from over-simplistic speculation in the discussion.

   c) A sentence has been added to the results section of the abstract stating "The differences in outcome variables between 2002 baseline data and the 2004 follow-up data were small."

2. The abbreviation O.R. and C.I. has been spelled out in the abstract the first time used, as odds ratio and 95% confidence interval, respectively.

3. The wording of the footnote has been clarified for Tables 4-6. Footnotes now read "Estimated High refers to 2 or more program exposures, Estimated Medium refers to greater than or equal to 1 program exposure but less than 2 program exposures, and Estimated low refers to less than 1 program exposure (reference), as estimated using Poisson regression at the 1st stage of the analysis"

BMC Editorial Team Comments:

1. A statement has been included in the Methods section indicating that the Tulane University Institutional Review Board approved this study.

2. A conclusion section has been added to highlight the main points of the paper.