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Dear Dr Aldcroft,

we revised the manuscript “Does Googling for preconception care result in information consistent with international guidelines? A comparison of information found by Italian women of childbearing age and health professionals” by Eleonora Agricola, Francesco Gesualdo, Elisabetta Pandolfi, Michaela V Gonfiantini, Emanuela Carloni, Pierpaolo Mastroiacovo, Alberto E Tozzi, according to the comments of the referees.

We hope it now fulfills your requests.

Please find below a point by point response to the referees’ requests:

**Referee #1**

1. **Many conditions can be prevented…low birth weight and prematurity.**  
   Page 3 Line 40: we have added “prematurity” to the sentence.

2. **Although recommended…childbearing age and offered by health care professionals.**  
   Page 3 Line 46: we have added “offered by healthcare professionals” to the sentence.

3. **Some numbers have to be corrected: 60,1%=60.1%; 48,9%=48.9%; 5,8%=5.8%, etc.**  
   Page 3 Line 56 and in various other locations: The format of
the numbers has been corrected.

4. **In this section the authors consider 21 women planning a pregnancy and 18 health care professionals. I think it right to indicate some information about these groups: for example age, education, occupation for women and the type of profession for health care professionals.**

Page 4 Lines 78-80: The available data about the interviewed women and health care professional have been added to the text.

5. **In this section it could be of interest to detail information about maternal weight and alcohol exposure (reported in Table 3).**

Unfortunately we could not provide detailed information about maternal weight and alcohol exposure in the Results section, as we did not ask any personal information to the interviewed women rather than age, occupancy and educational level. In table 3 we have reported the general recommendations according the AJOG guidelines that we have reviewed on the analysed websites.

**Referee #2**

1. **The authors should better describe the ranking process for the websites they have analyzed.**

Page 5 Lines 83-86: the selection of the strings has been better described explaining in details the Google Adwords (Keyword Tool) properties.

2. **The authors should indicate the p-value level that was considered**
significant, and if there is any difference in the statistical significance of each variable between the univariate and multivariate analysis.

Page 6  Line 120: we indicated the statistical significance for the univariate and multivariate analysis

3. Revise the proportions indicated in the following statement: We found that 60.0% of websites presented commercial links; among them, 68.3% were from women’s search, compared with 51.7% obtained from health professionals’ search.

Page 7 Lines 150-153: we checked the proportion of the websites containing commercial links. They were correct, nonetheless the text was misleading. Therefore we reworded the sentence in order to make the information consistent with the data.

4. Indicate the relevance of the following result: According to the multivariate analysis, correct recommendations were positively associated with presence of a commercial link in the web page for all items except asthma control (aOR 2.734; CI 0.854-8.756; p=0.09), pertussis immunization (aOR 0.989; CI 0.131-7.467; p=0.992), illicit drug cessation (aOR 2.350; CI 0.787-7.020; p=0.126), physical exercise (aOR 1.127; CI 0.331-3.840; p=0.848), avoiding toxics and pesticides (aOR 1.212; CI 0.235-6.261; p=0.818).

Pages 7-8 Lines 154-158: the relevance of the multivariate analysis reporting
association between correct recommendations and the presence of a commercial link in the web page has been explained.

5. **In tables the authors should specify the 95% CI.**

95% CI has been added in Table 3.

6. **The authors should better declare the main finding of the study at the beginning of the discussion.**

Page 8 Lines 161-163: We reworded the beginning of the Discussion in order to give more emphasis to the main result of the study.

7. **Please revise discussion about rubella and pertussis to a better integration in the text.**

Page 9 Lines 190-202: pertussis and rubella discussion has been better integrated in the text.

8. **The authors should specifically dedicate a paragraph to the study strengths and limitations.**

Page 10 Line 217: the strengths and the limitations of the study have been separated in a dedicated paragraph in the Discussion section.

Yours sincerely,

Eleonora Agricola, PhD

(Corresponding author)
Bambino Gesù Children Hospital, IRCCS, Epidemiology Unit, Piazza S. Onofrio 4, 00165 Rome - Italy
Tel: +390668592401; +393474779061; Fax: +390668592300
E-mail: eleonora.agricola@gmail.com