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Dear Editors:

I am writing to submit the revision of the above-listed manuscript for your re-consideration for publication. It is our understanding that the paper required some formatting changes, which have been made, as well as some discretionary revisions that we have addressed in the text and below. Our specific responses are as follows:

A. Formatting changes included:

- Remove titles from names, i.e. MD, PhD
- Move title to the top of the page
- Move authors’ names to the top of the page
- Put affiliated institution, with department, city, state, country
- Make section headings in bigger font
- Take out “Table ‘x’ here” from the text
- Put “no competing interests” UNDER that section name.
- Change all journal names in the References to full name.

B. Discretionary revisions from the Reviewer included:

1. Clearer description of to what extent the AIOS was completed with/without help in the three studies. We have added a statement relevant to the availability of assistance to the Methods sections for each of the three substudies (p. 5 under Subjects for Substudy 1; p.8 under Subjects and Procedures for Substudy 2; p. 11 under Subjects and Procedures for Substudy 3).

2. Numbers of people who were approached. Unfortunately, we do not have the precise numbers for this question. We used student assistants to distribute the forms and stand by with
the instructor to collect the completed questionnaires. Although we usually obtain such specific information in our studies, this was not done in these particular substudies.

3. **Response rate and incomplete questionnaires.** As above, we do not have that information. We do know that the most of the persons approached and given a questionnaire did complete it.

4. **Some discussion of acceptability and feasibility in light of the above information.** We have removed the word “acceptable” from the Discussion sentence 2 on p. 12. We have added a comment about the Reviewer’s point that up to 10% of some populations can have difficulty with completion of visual analogue scales.

5. “…it would be clearer if the scale was reproduced in the paper exactly as given to the patients…” We have added the clarification that the scale is horizontal in nature on p. 4 Methods and have added an Appendix at the end of the paper with the scale itself shown.

6. **Is test-retest reproducibility or something similar, planned in future work?** We have added comments about the issues for test-retest reproducibility on p. 12 (bottom) to p. 13 (“Establishing temporal stability…”).

There were no other revisions required, to our knowledge. We look forward to your response and will be happy to continue to work with your staff to put the paper into publication. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

**Iris R. Bell**
Iris R. Bell, MD PhD  
Professor of Psychiatry, Psychology, Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health  
Director of Research, Program in Integrative Medicine  
ibell@u.arizona.edu or irbellmd@aol.com