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The Editor  
BMC IH&HR

Dear Sir,
Below are our responses to the reviewer’s comments. We have responded point by point to each of her comments and made the necessary corrections.

Sincerely,

N. Uguru

**Response to Reviewer’s report.**

**Reviewer : 3**  
**Title:** Inequities in incidence, morbidity and expenditures on prevention and treatment in southeast Nigeria  
**Version:** 4 **Date:** 15 April 2009  
**Reviewer:** Marcy Erskine

**Reviewer’s report:**  
In general, the paper is much improved from the last version.  
Minor Essential Revisions  
1. The paper should have another edit for language, grammar, etc. A couple of examples are the first sentence in the rationale (first thing a person will read after the title), and the last full sentences on pages 14 and 15. There are others, and perhaps having someone unrelated to the paper edit the language would be helpful.

Author’s response

- The first sentence after rationale has been corrected, and the subheading rationale has been corrected and changed to Background as stipulated by the journal. And so the correction is now the first sentence after Background on the Abstract page.

- The language and grammar have been corrected in different sections of the manuscript.

2. I find the results presentation still a bit choppy. It is bizarre to state that most of the villages were x and then cite two of the villages as examples. It is no longer most, it is half. There are numerous examples in that section.

Author’s response
Discretionary Revisions
1. I still find that the conclusions drawn stretch the data presented.

Author’s response

- We believe that the conclusion is a true reflection of the results and adequately summarizes whilst also laying emphasis on our key findings. In addition, some recommendations were made based on the findings.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.