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January 25, 2015

Giulia Mangiameli
Executive Editor
BMC Medical Research Methodology

Dear Editor Mangiameli:

Enclosed is our revised manuscript titled “Eliciting parental support for the use of newborn blood spots for pediatric research” for consideration for publication as a research article in BMC Medical Research Methodology. We thank the peer reviewers for re-reviewing the manuscript and providing their points of clarification. We have implemented their suggestions in the manuscript.

This manuscript has not been published except in abstract and poster form to the American College of Epidemiology Annual meeting, Silver Spring, MD, Sept 8, 2014. It is not being considered for publication elsewhere. All authors have approved the manuscript and have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Sincerely,

Edwina Yeung, PhD, ScM
Point-by-point responses are included below.

Reviewer: William Funk

Discretionary Revisions:
Line 161- The sentence "The amount of eluted sample remaining was usually minimal to none for most analytes" is unclear. Does this mean that that the punch of blood was fully extracted, or that the assay used all of the sample + buffer? If the former, how was this determined? If the later, this statement might be more clear if inserted after line 164.

Response: Thank you Dr. Frank for reviewing the revised manuscript. We did mean the latter and have moved the sentence to after line 164.

Reviewer: William Siero

Reviewer's report:
As stated in all of the reviews this paper is of high quality and represents an important contribution to the field. It has been further improved following minor revisions and I would strongly support its publication.

Minor Essential Revisions:
“For” is missing from the following sentence on page 15, line 298 “making it a great resource population based studies.”

Response: Thank you for catching this typo Dr. Siero. We have added the “for.”