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Author's response to reviews:

COVER LETTER

Dear Editor,

Please find attached our revised manuscript 'Design and respondent selection of a population-based study on associations between breast cancer screening, lifestyle and quality of life', and comments to the reviewer below this letter.

Our manuscript is original in presentation and content and the results have not been published elsewhere. We believe that the manuscript fits well within the critical viewpoints in epidemiology of the BMC Public Health.

On the behalf of the working group,

Tytti Sarkeala
The corresponding author
Finnish Cancer Registry
Unioninkatu 20–22
00130 Helsinki
Finland
tytti.sarkeala@cancer.fi
tel +358 50 411 4238
Comments to the reviewer

We thank the reviewer for valuable comments on our manuscript.

Sections

Abstract and Methods

Minor Essential Revisions: 1) Is “mother tongue” another term for native language or primary language? Could this term be defined or changed, example “mother’s native tongue” so that it is more appropriate for readers outside of this study’s country.

Answer: We have changed the term “mother tongue” to “primary language” throughout the manuscript.

Section

Results:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) Page 8 lines 177-178: The authors mention this state to summarize the results for similarities found between number of respondents and the distribution of the demographic characteristics:

Nevertheless, the overall number of respondents as well as the distribution of demographic characteristics was similar in both birth cohorts (IRR 1.02, 95% CI 0.97-1.08). Is the IRR presented to best characterize these associations? It appears to be the IRR for the “year of birth” variable from Table 3? Please explain.

2) It would be good to provide the table for the SWLS estimates, as these results are highlighted as a major finding in the abstract and in the Discussion.

Answers:

1) The IRR refers to birth cohorts 1963 and 1964, which are now named as birth cohorts also in table 4 instead of previous “year of birth”.

2) We have created a new Figure 2, which illustrates distribution of Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) among the respondents by demographic characteristics provided in the study. We also refer to this figure in the manuscript in page 9, row 180.
Section Discussion:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) Are there any additional limitations or strengths to the current analysis that could be noted? Have there been any other studies that have used the inverse probability weighting or the multiple imputation method to compare with, in a similar study design?

Answer: We have added three new references (numbers 30-32) which assess the utilization of inverse probability weighting and multiple imputation in various study designs. These issues are also addressed in Discussion in page 11, rows 235-241.