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To

Victorino Silvestre

Journal Editorial Office, BioMed Central

Subject: Submission of revised manuscript (MS: 1232209530136354) for publication

Dear Editor,

We are thankful for your prompt action on the manuscript entitled “Injection practice in Kaski district, Western Nepal: A community perspective” for consideration of publication in your esteemed journal as an original article.

As per your suggestion and requirement, we have made some changes in our manuscript which is indicated using blue font letters. The point-by-point answer to your queries and description of the changes made are given on the next page. We are re-submitting the revised manuscript for further necessary actions.

Thanking you in positive response.

Yours’ sincerely,

Sudesh Gyawali & coauthors
Assistant Professor,
Department of Pharmacology
MCOMS, Pokhara, Nepal
E-mail: sudeshgy@hotmail.com
Query 1. Please state in your manuscript whether your study received ethics approval and by which committee.

Answer: The study was approved by NHRC Ethical Review Board on 9th May 2012. The information has been added in the manuscript line number 273.

Query 2. Please clarify in your manuscript why parental consent was obtained for study participants under the age of 14 and not under the age of 16 and whether the ethics committee approved this.

Answer: In the National Ethical Guidelines provided by the Nepal Health Research Council (NHRC) it has mentioned that the informed consent of the children has to be taken from the parents or legal guardian of the child. As respondents of age less than 14 years are considered to be children, the informed consent for these respondents were taken from their parents. Furthermore, few studies had also collected information about a child from their accompanying mother if the child was of age less than 13 years (refer to reference 28 of the manuscript). The WHO in the same reference (Ref. 28) also recommended to collect data from the parents (especially mother), if the respondent age is less than 15 years. In our study, although the informed consent of the respondents of age 15 years or more was taken from the respondents directly, the data was collected in the presence of their parents. Furthermore, only respondents of age 18 years or more were selected for the FGDs.

As the study was not interventional or directly harmful to the human subjects (respondents), the informed consent section was emphasized less in the study.
protocol submitted to NHRC. The issue of association of informed consent with the respondents’ age was not mentioned in the study protocol submitted to NHRC nor did the authority asked for more information regarding the same. As mentioned in the study protocol and in our manuscript verbal informed consent was obtained for the respondents before administration of the questionnaire and/or before focus group discussion.