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Dear Dr. Grandjean:

I am pleased to submit our second round of revision to our manuscript entitled: “IRB Challenges in Community-based Participatory Research on Human Exposure to Environmental Toxins: A Case Study.”

We made the following changes in the second round of revisions to this paper:

1) We have expanded the abstract to provide more detail.

2) We added to the Conclusion a brief summary of the findings. We did not feel it was possible to make the Conclusion briefer overall, however.

3) We left the subheadings in the Results section to make it easier for readers to identify the distinct elements of our qualitative findings. Because journal guidelines indicate subheadings are allowed, we felt that leaving these in the manuscript would be acceptable.

4) We carefully reviewed the Methods, Results, and Discussion sections to see if there were parts that belonged in another section. We did not find that to be the case. The narrative form of this qualitative article lends itself to the format in which we have presented it. We agreed with your assessment that the beginning of the Results section may initially appear to contain background material; however, since this section in fact covers general findings regarding how researchers view CBPR ethics issues we felt that it should remain where it was. This information derives from our interviews and observations, and in order to make that clearer, we have added in text in some places including phrases such as “Interviewees reported that…” In addition, since some of the material comes from our interactions with our own IRB, we report this information without the above-type prefatory remarks.

5) We did not see parts of the text which we thought could be cut further without sacrificing important details. In particular the Discussion contains specific recommendations and strategies for researchers in dealing with IRBs when they are undertaking CBPR strategies in this era of environmental health research.

6) We added some references where requested, and formatted references according to the journal’s format.

If you have questions regarding our resubmission, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Rachel Morello-Frosch, Ph.D., M.P.H.  Associate Professor, School of Public Health and Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management