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June 14, 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

Thanks for the concern and support during the long process of review.

In my previous letter on 6th of April 2006, I responded in detail to all the comments posed to me by the referees on my manuscript. In this letter, I am trying to respond on the new comments sent to me by the referees after second revision. For me this is a very good learning process and I appreciate the efforts done by your journal in improving the standard of my manuscript.

In the next part of my letter I will focus my attention to give my response to the questions and comments raised by the referees.

Referee #1
1- This review concentrates solely on the statistical aspects of this manuscript and raises a number of minor essential revisions. In the results section when describing Table 1 there is a paragraph or so of text which places the results into context with other surveys “this should be moved to the discussion section. This is also true for other parts of the results section “this part of the manuscript should concentrate solely on reporting the findings of the current study.

Response: Yes, I am agreed to the comments given by the referee about contextualizing of the results of the study while describing the important results of my study under the section of results. This was done with a hope to accommodate the comments sent to me by a referee previously. Since, I am agreed with the present referee, I have moved these parts of my results to the first paragraph under the section of discussion on page 11.
2- I am a little concerned by the choice of analysis methods for this study. The data that are being analyzed are inherently discrete and yet methods of analysis are chosen which are appropriate for continuous, normally distributed data. Have the authors checked the assumptions required for these analyses to be valid? If so, this should be stated in the manuscript; if the assumptions aren’t valid then non-parametric or discrete analysis techniques should be used.

**Response:** Thanks for the comment. After consulting and discussing this comment with my supervisor and also with the statistician involved in my study we think that we have used the right statistical discourse. Our dependent variable is HSCL-10 and we have used mean of the HSCL-10 item score, therefore linear regression is appropriate. This has been explained under the section of material and methods in the last part of first paragraph on page number 8.

3- From a presentation viewpoint is it not better to presents the results in Table 3 as adjusted means for each of the variables rather than the beta coefficient from a regression analysis? It makes it much easier for the reader to see what the differences are and their magnitude.

**Response:** Since we have several levels (up to 10) of the independent variables in table 3, therefore, we preferred to present coefficients from regression analysis. Coefficient summarizes the overall fit for all levels.

4- The authors note in at least two places that interaction analyses revealed some interesting results yet decide not to show such results. Wouldn’t it be of interest to the reader to see these results if they are, as you claim, interesting?

Thanks for diverting our attention to this issue. We have taken this comment into consideration according to the wish of the referee and these results were further elaborated in second and third paragraph under the section of results on page 10. These interactions were further elaborated in the discussion section as well.

**Referee #2**
No comments were given by the second referee.

Once again thank for the concern and support.

Hammad Raza Syed