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Author’s response to reviews:

23 December 2017

Paramala Santosh

Editor

BMC Pediatrics
Dear Dr Santosh,

Thank you for the most recent round of reviews which pointed to the need for careful copy-editing. Below is a point-by-point detailed summary of how we have responded to the reviews.

With thanks
Caroline Jones

--

Reviewer reports:

Justine Dol (Reviewer 1): Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript again. It is clear that the authors have taken into serious consideration previous feedback, however, a few minor revisions are suggested:

- Please revise throughout the abstract and manuscript your tense when referring to the LiTTLe program. As the program is no longer running, it should be discussed in past tense.

  * This change of tense has been made throughout.

- The manuscript needs to be edited throughout for grammatical issues and tense inconsistencies.

  * The manuscript has now been edited carefully for all spelling, grammar and sentence structure errors as requested by Reviewers 1 and 3. A full list is provided below.

Åse Boman, Ph.D (Reviewer 2): Thank you for your revised version, I now think your manuscript is ready for acceptance.

Antony Simon Opwora, MPH (Reviewer 3): This third draft of the manuscript is well written and the authors have shown great ability to assimilate changes that have been suggested by
reviewers. I am happy with the editing that was done in accordance with the previous suggestions but I urge the authors to proofread the manuscript for spelling, grammar and sentence structure errors that call for their attention.

--

List of copy editing changes made:

p. 2 para 1 line 4. Abstract. Changed "aims" to "aimed".

p. 5 para 2, line 4. Changed "were" to "are".

p. 5 para 2, line 10 changed "in which" to "and".

p. 6 para 3-4. Changed present tense to past tense throughout in regards to LiTTLe program.

p. 7 para 1-2. Changed present tense to past tense throughout in regards to LiTTLe program.

p. 9 para 3, line 1. Changed "is" to "was".

p. 10 para 1, second last line. Corrected apostrophe placement.

p. 11 para 2, second last line. Changed tense from past to pluperfect "had attended".

p. 12 para 1, second last line. Changed tense "afforded" to "had afforded".

p. 12 para 2, 2nd line. Changed tense to "had had".

p. 15, para 2, line 1. Changed "is" to "was".

p. 15, para 2, second last line. Changed tense to "had explained".

p. 16, para 2. Capitalised "Western children".

p. 17, para 1. Changed present tense to past tense throughout in regards to LiTTLe program.

p. 18, para 2. Used pluperfect e.g. "had shared" instead of simple past.

p. 19, para 2. Changed tense to past.

p. 21, para 2. Changed tense to past.

p. 25, para 2. Used pluperfect "had had expectations".

p. 27, para 1, 3. Changed tense to past.

p. 28, para 2, 3. Changed tense to past.
p. 30, second and last line. Fixed inconsistency in dash/hyphen use.

p. 33, para 2, line 1. Changed present perfect to simple past.