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Dear Dr. Melissa Norton:

I am sending you the revised manuscript, "Impact of periodic health examination on surgical treatment for uterine fibroids in Beijing: a case-control study," for consideration for possible publication in the Research Article section of BMC Health Services Research. Following is the point-by-point response to Reviewers’ further comments.

Sincerely yours,

Haiyun Wu, MD

28 Fuxing Road

Beijing 100853, PR China

Phone: (+86)010-66936756

Fax: (+86)010-88270497

e-mail: why46301@163.com
Reply to Dr. Andreas Hackethal’s comments:

The authors should provide a figure or table to highlighten the material and methods section of approaching women for the study! This would make the study much more understandable

*We’ve provided a figure of flow-chart of study subject selection. We hope this figure may help readers to understand the study.*

Reply to Dr. Joanna Stewart’s comments:

The methods have been changed to explain that conditional logistic regression was used to calculated the odds ratios and confidence intervals, thus allowing for the pairing of a case with its control. However the paper still reports chi square tests which I assume were done without regard to matching. These p values should be removed from table 1, the text should be adjusted and the description of them removed from the methods. In fact the unadjusted conditional logistic regression correctly tests what was attempting to be investigated using the chi square analysis. The actual numbers can still be reported in table 1 without the p value column. P values for the overall test for each of the variables could be added to the odds ratio table – eg the overall p value for the test that employment status was related to being a case or control (not the 2 separate ones for the contrasts of the individual levels)
The authors are grateful for Dr. Joanna Stewart’s comments on the statistics of the previous manuscript. We now understand and fully agree that chi square analysis is not necessary, because we had used unadjusted conditional logistic regression. We do not add p value in Table 2, because we have provided the 95% CIs, and the important p values have been presented in the text. We’ve made related adjustment in the text in terms of statistics.

We have also corrected the grammatical errors as pointed by Dr. Joanna Stewart.