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Covering letter

April 6, 2006

To
Editor-in-Chief
BMC Public Health
BioMed Central Ltd
Middlesex House
34-42 Cleveland Street
London W1T 4LB, UK.

From
Hammad Raza Syed
Institute of General Practice and Community Medicine (IASAM)
Department of International Community Health
P.O. Box 1130 Blindern
N-0318 Oslo, Norway

Dear Editor

First of all thanks for accepting delay on my part due to my field visit in Pakistan and also due to inefficient communication system in that part of Pakistan. I am also thankful for sending me reviewer's comment. I consider these comments as an opportunity to improve my manuscript.

As the editor of the journal, I want to explain to you that we are working on a project that deals with the impact of migration on health among Pakistani immigrants in Oslo. We are trying to deal with this issue both from a somatic and a psychosocial point of view. Our first article has dealt with the issue of health inequality both in terms of distress and diabetes from the vantage of SES. This present article is dealing with the psychosocial factors. However, in the light of experiences secured through these two articles, we decided to collect another set of data. Our next articles would be based on the more cultural sensitive information regarding the Pakistani community. hence, we are a little bit hesitant to jump from one issue to another issue in any single article. However, we hope that we will make our point clear regarding the health of this immigrant community. We are trying to follow a certain sequence. This kind of work has never been done in the Norwegian context. Therefore, it may be possible for the reviewer to think that we are not extending our discussion to quite open and obvious issues in the same article.

We have also revised the sequence of co-authors in the revised version of our manuscript.

In the coming section of my letter, I want to discuss my response on each of the comment given on our manuscript by the reviewers.
Reviewer #1

1. In response to this comment, we focused our attention on the association between socio-demographic variables and the psychosocial factors in the two communities under investigation. We found interesting interactions. The results of these finding were accommodated under the section of results, in the second paragraph on page 10, i.e. "when looking into relationship------------------another paper from the same sample".

2. We agree with the reviewer's comment and therefore we are providing with more information to elaborate the underlying differences in the socio-demographic characteristics of these two communities. You will find our response related to these comments on page 9 under the section of results in the first paragraph, i.e., "These differences-------- With limited or no education".

3. This is very interesting comment made by the reviewer and we know that both socio-economic and psychosocial factors have an impact on the lifestyle. But it was not possible for us to elaborate the mentioned link in this current study. In our next study we are trying to observe this relationship among these ethnic communities. Social support in our study was registered against two variables, i.e. how many good friends do you have (Count those whom you can take to in confidence and who can help you when you need help. Do not count those who you live together with, but includes other relatives.)? And how much interest do people show in the things you do? We have not included marital status as a source of social support, because of different characteristics of cohabiting pattern and related cultural aspects of marital status in these two communities. But still according to the reviewer comment we reanalyzed our data for tables 2, 3 and 4. In reanalyzing we adjusted for marital status. We ended up with no difference in the results, as the way we had already presented the data. Therefore, we opt to keep it as such.

4. We are thankful to our reviewer for diverting our attention towards a very special issue with regard to the health, SE and Race. We have responded to this issue on page 13 in the last paragraph, i.e. "as a conclusion-----------------individual characteristics".

5. We have consulted our statistician according to the reviewer's advice. There are two statisticians in our study as co-authors. Both of them were little bit hesitant to perform a matching analysis in case of this study. According to them by adopting such a strategy would lose the information/power of the study and analysis would be more complicated and conditional logistic regression would be then our choice. Moreover, we would not be able to provide more information than we had already described in our present statistics.

6. Again this was a short coming of our paper not to discuss the migration history of Pakistanis to Norway. We have now responded to it under the section of introduction, and a subheading was made "Pakistanis in Norway" to elaborate this issue. You can find our response on page 6.

7. We are also agreeing with the reviewer that sample population was not described properly. Now we have dealt with this issue under the section sample on page 7. Our response is "The response rate for ethnic Norwegians------------------was identical to their country of birth. This paper is written out of the data material collected and planned by the larger institutions in Norway and they have described and explained their methodology in an article, which has been previously published and in our paper, reference number of that article is 26.

8. Yes, about this reviewer comment we are agreed that it was the weakness of our study. But actually this issue was somehow ignored by the planners of the Oslo Health Study. Therefore, we were left with no option but just to use the available information. We have taken this issue very seriously and therefore a new set of data has already been collected in Norway and Pakistan based on the cultural sensitive instruments. We have used a long protocol to translate the instrument of powerlessness. Moreover, in our study we have also made amendments in other instruments. We have discussed our concern on this issue in our paper as well. This you will find on the page 14 in the second paragraph and in the last sentence.

9. This is another reality to which we are agreed with the reviewer. We have responded to this issue according to the context of our paper on the page 13 in the last part of the last paragraph.

10. Thanks to the reviewer to giving us comments related to the Cronbach’s alpha for empowerment scale. We have tried to deal with this issue more cautiously now. You will find our response on page 9, in second paragraph, i.e. the internal consistency----------------Cronbach’s alpha was 0.63 and 0.64".

11. We are also agreed with this reviewer comment and we have deleted that part of first table which was related to the total household income. But their situation has been taken into consideration in the paper. You will certainly find comments on it under the section results, in the middle of the first paragraph on page 10.

Reviewer #2

The second reviewer had raised no comments with regard to our manuscript.
Thanks for kind considerations. Have a nice Easter.

Best regards,

Hammad Raza Syed