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Dr. Lolu da-Silva  
Assistant Editor, BMC-series journals  
34-42 Cleveland Street  
London  
W1T 4LB

Dear Dr. da-Silva:

My coauthors and I would like to thank you and the reviewers for feedback regarding our manuscript, “If You Feed Them, They Will Come: A Prospective Study of the Effects of Complimentary Food on Attendance and Physician Attitudes at Medical Grand Rounds at an Academic Medical Center” (Ms: 9624113581206476), which we submitted previously for your consideration for publication in BMC Medical Education.

The manuscript has been prepared according to the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals. However, in the event the manuscript is accepted for publication, it will be reformatted following your journal-specific guidelines.

As a result of the feedback, we have made the following revisions:

Reviewer 1 (Kristi Ferguson):
• The observation that the data are not separated by training status (faculty vs fellows/residents) is an excellent point. This is a limitation of our study because we were unable to separate our data based on training status. We have commented on this in our “Discussion” section.
• We have changed our “Methods” section to reflect that food was available for purchase during the pre–complimentary food period in response to the reviewer’s question as to whether it was the fact that food was free or that it was available in conjunction with the CME session.
• We have acknowledged in our “Discussion” section that measuring the influence of drug company sponsorship by self-report may be biased (Major Compulsory Revision).
• In the “Results” section, we added “per MGR session” to our statement of attendee counts to address the reviewer’s comments regarding what the overall rates represent. This text was also added to Table 1, “Head Counts of Attendees at Medical Grand Rounds.”
• In the “Introduction” section, “principle objective” has been changed to “principal objective” as the reviewer suggested.
• We have discussed the reviewer’s suggestion for future research in our “Discussion” section.

Reviewer 2 (Don E Moore):
• In our “Discussion” section, we addressed the reviewer’s comment about breaking down our data by type of attendee (physician, trainee, and nonphysician).
• We have addressed the reviewer’s comment about the generalizability of our study in the “Discussion” section.
• Our “Discussion” section addresses the reviewer’s comment about “placing the role of food in context.”
• In our “Discussion” section, we have acknowledged the possibility that industry support may subtly influence the attendee regardless of the self-report data.
• An explanation of the choice of our statistical technique has been added to our “Methods” section.

Again, we would like to thank you and the reviewers for the feedback regarding our manuscript. If there are any questions, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Colin Segovis