Author’s response to reviews

Title: The role of children and their socioeconomic resources for the risk of hospitalisation and mortality – A nationwide register-based study of the total Swedish population over the age 70

Authors:

Anna Meyer (anna.meyer@ki.se)
Hannah Brooke (hannah.brooke@ki.se)
Karin Modig (karin.modig@ki.se)

Version: 2 Date: 08 Apr 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:

1. Thank you for including information regarding your ethics approval. However, in the Ethics approval section of your Declarations, please provide the full name of the committee that approved this study.

Answer: Thank you. We have added the Swedish full name, see red text below.

This study was approved by the regional ethics committee in Stockholm (Regionala Etikprövningsnämnden i Stockholm, EPN) (permit numbers Dnr 2011/136-31/5 and Dnr 2015/1917-32). The board waived the need for individual consent.

2. Please provide a List of abbreviations after the Conclusions section. If abbreviations are used in the text, they should be defined in the text at first use and included in this list.

Answer: The only abbreviations used are HR for hazard ratio and CI for confidence interval. We have now listed these.

3. Please provide an “Additional Files” section after the References where you list the following information about each of your supplementary files:

- File name (e.g. Additional File 1)
- Title of data
- Brief description of the data
Please ensure that all additional files are explicitly referred to in the main text.

Answer: This is now added. And yes, all supplementary files are referred to in the main text.

4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colors. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Answer: Yes.

BMC Geriatrics operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Atsushi Miyawaki, M.D., Ph.D. (Reviewer 1): The manuscript has been revised well. I think this manuscript will be acceptable after a correction has been done.

Answer: Thank you.

Minor point:

In the Strengths and Limitations, the authors state "Thus, both specificity (all with a severe condition are hospitalised) and sensitivity (the hospitalised are truly ill) should be high given the definition of onset of severe disease."

But the reviewer thinks the specificity may not be so high even if Sweden's health care system is publicly financed, because low-SES/educated group may suffer from access to social support (Since I am not Swedish, I need some objective data to realize the specificity would be high enough.) If the authors do not have objective data about the specificity, please make the expression more modest one (e.g., ...specificity..... might be high....., etc.).

Answer: Ok. We have made the statement more modest, from:
Thus, both specificity (all with a severe condition are hospitalised) and sensitivity (the hospitalised are truly ill) should be high given the definition of onset of severe disease.

To:

Thus, we believe both specificity (all with a severe condition are hospitalised) and sensitivity (the hospitalised are truly ill) are high given the definition of onset of severe disease.