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February 21, 2014

Re: “Lack of access to chemotherapy for colon cancer: Multiplicative disadvantage of being extremely poor, inadequately insured and African American”

Dear Dr. Leoncio:

This letter may serve as my formal resubmission of the above noted manuscript on behalf of all co-authors. Our responses to the two reviewers’ and your editorial comments/suggestions are outlined in point-counterpoint fashion below. We greatly appreciate this peer review editorial guidance. Our manuscript seems to us to be a clearer scholarly presentation because of it.

Additionally, we reviewed the revised manuscript again to ensure that it conforms to your journal’s style. We hope that our revised manuscript will now meet with your acceptance for publication. Thank you for your editorial direction.

Sincerely,

Kevin M. Gorey
Professor

Editor’s Direction
1. Include authors’ contributions section according to the journal’s style before the acknowledgements and reference list.
   • This was done as noted below (p. 14).
   KMG conceptualized the study, led the study design and writing and supervised the analysis. SH performed the analysis and assisted with study design, data interpretation and writing. INL, EB, FCW and SMK assisted with study design, data interpretation and writing. KMG and INL also obtained funding. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Reviewer 1 (No critical comments/suggestions)

Reviewer 2:
1. As suggested, 10 “minor issues” were editorially corrected as directed.
2. As discretionarily suggested, the colloquial word Obamacare was changed to the Affordable Care Act in the abstract.
3. The manuscript underwent another internal editorial review by two research team members as directed.

Discretionary revisions not made:
1. In the background section, we originally stated, “That is, their AA participants probably had substantially lower incomes than their NHWA counterparts, even in the lowest income neighborhoods studied” The details have been presented elsewhere. We would prefer to leave it to interested readers to refer to reference # 22 and #23. Our editorial attempts to insert those details seemed to detract from the clarity of this scholarly story.
2. In the methods section, we originally stated that people of other racial or ethnic backgrounds were excluded. Our assertion that AAs are probably this field’s most vulnerable group was presented and much referenced in the background section. Our assertion that it is important to analyze the experience of each different racial/ethnic group uniquely along with references to our previous analyses of the unique experiences of Mexican Americans were also presented and referenced in the background section (references #24 to #26). To reiterate in the methods section seemed confusing to us so we preferred not to do so.