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March 18, 2009

Melissa Norton, MD
Editor-in-Chief
BMC Health Services Research

RE: Revisions to Ms. No. 7678531352239858

Dear Dr. Norton:

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our paper entitled “Development of the Chicago Food Allergy Research Surveys: Assessing Knowledge, Attitudes, and Beliefs of Parents, Physicians and the General Public.” We have responded to each of the reviewer’s helpful comments below. We have also enclosed both marked and unmarked versions of our revised manuscript for review by the Editorial Office and the original reviewers if needed.

____________________________________________________________________

REVIEWER #1

Major Compulsory Revisions

None

Minor Essential Revisions

Q1.1 The numbering of the tables are confused. In the Results Table 2 should read table 1, table 3 should read table2 and table 1 should read table 3 (page 15 in the manuscript).

Response: We apologize for this mistake and appreciate your attention to detail. In order to ensure that the table numbering appears sequentially in the text, the tables were re-ordered at the end of the manuscript file.

Q1.2 Page 16, second paragraph, fourth line a misspelling, should read web-based.

Response: Thank you for noticing this error. The text now reads “web-based.”

Discretionary Revisions

Q1.3 It would be helpful if some explanation as to the tools used in validation was included, i.e. how the Likert scale was used.

Response: We would be happy to provide any additional explanation if needed. However, we are unclear on what exactly is being suggested here. If you could, please provide more specific information on the desired change(s) so we can revise accordingly.

____________________________________________________________________

REVIEWER #2
Q2.1 …I think the paper would be much improved if we were provided with some data and conclusions demonstrating the surveys in action. Thus as stated in the aims the knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs among these three populations is the point of interest and I think some information is required to round out the paper. It would seem data is available…I would not expect all the data to be analyzed however we could be given information on the answers provided by the survey to important questions in the field and how these confirm or add to existing knowledge. It would seem that we could be provided information on the survey in use without compromising any subsequent publication that the authors may have in mind.

Response: We agree that the data generated from each survey is a major point of interest. However, we also feel a paper detailing the development and validation of these tools is an important aspect of our research, and our primary focus here. Through the publication of this paper, we hope to make the tools available for clinicians and researchers who wish to assess knowledge, identify attitudinal barriers, and develop targeted and effective interventions to improve the lives of children and families affected by food allergy. Further, we hope the methodology detailed in the manuscript will prove a valuable resource to academicians from all backgrounds who wish to produce validated survey instruments to assess health knowledge and beliefs.

You correctly infer that we intend to publish the results from each survey separately. Since our initial submission, results from the general public survey have been accepted for publication, and results from the parent and physician surveys are being prepared for submission. Per your request, we have included a brief statement addressing our initial findings in the conclusion, but feel more detailed information is beyond the scope of this paper. We are also concerned about publishing identical data in two separate manuscripts, but are open to any suggestions you may have to avoid this conflict.

We appreciate your continued consideration of our manuscript and feel the above revisions have strengthened the text. Please do not hesitate to contact me for further information or with any questions that may arise.

Sincerely,

Ruchi S. Gupta, MD MPH
Children’s Memorial Hospital
2300 Children’s Plaza, Box 157
Chicago, IL 60640
T. 312.573.7747 | F. 312.573.7825
rugupta@childrensmemorial.org