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April 22, 2011

Doug Altman, Editor-in-Chief
Trials
BioMed Central Ltd
Floor 6, 236 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8HB
United Kingdom

Dear. Dr. Altman,

Thank you again for reviewing the manuscript entitled, “Comparison of early-, late-, and non-participants in a school-based asthma management program for urban high school students”, and for the opportunity to respond to the latest reviewer critiques. Our submission includes:

1. Responses to additional critiques of Reviewer 1
2. A revised manuscript with track changes and line numbers (.pdf)
3. A revised manuscript with no track changes and no line numbers (msword)

Please do not hesitate to contact me if there are additional questions about our manuscript. We look forward to your review.

Sincerely,

Christine LM Joseph, PhD
Epidemiologist
On behalf of authors
1. **Results**, line 177 – please remove the right parenthesis after “p=0.02”.
This has been corrected, line 177.

This has been corrected, line 47.

3. **Discretionary Revisions**
None

4. **Comment**: The additional information on the various comparisons that you provide in the revised text negates the need for adding p-values to Table 1. I believe that you really tried to do this, and noticed that the table would “become too confusing and difficult to read”. I noted in my prior review that adding the p-values might make the table unwieldy – this is why I considered this as a discretionary revision. So I concur with your decision to leave Table 1 as it is now presented.
Thank you for your comment. It was worth a try!

---

**REVIEWER 2**

No revisions necessary.