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Author’s response to reviews:

“Effects of the Home-based Educational Intervention on Health Outcomes among Primarily Hispanic Children with Asthma: A Quasi-Experimental Study”

Response to Reviewer Comments:

We would like to thank the reviewers for their feedback and valuable comments on our manuscript and for the opportunity to address their comments. Below are our responses to the comments from each reviewer. Page and line numbers are also provided (when applicable) to indicate the locations of addition and changes in the revised manuscript. We believe that the manuscript has improved significantly after addressing comments and suggestions offered by the reviewers.
Editor Comments:

1. While assessing your manuscript we found several instances where the text displayed overlap with other previously published works, in particular:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__doi.org_10.1177-252F2150129711426571&d=DwIGaQ&c=cpvmSBWXd8YiHoMtYk_a9E2QliaEheG3-gfMB16YPq0&r=m2QP1u4MBYnrltRJPIPuYN__soI321e-R1_PRoewZc&mh=DVF-R0e7XSfzD5TGyVGzJsUzvP2sfnIrPRFoevmV9CA&s=KGxZhKcI5pnyQHkhKoZCbU943zZbc29dBY7jSU75VBU&e=

Overlap with this previously published work was found mainly in lines 12 – 17.

While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. We would therefore be grateful if you could reformulate the aforementioned section of your paper to resolve the overlap between your manuscript and other sources. Please ensure that, where relevant, these sources are also referenced as appropriate.

If this study uses methodology from a previously published work, please provide a summarizing statement in the methodology together with a citation to the original paper.

Response: Thank you very much for your comments. We have rephrased those lines to avoid any problem.

2. In your Funding section, please also state the role of the funding body in the design of the study; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; and in writing the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. We have added the role of the funding body as follows: “This study was supported by the Knapp Care Community Foundation and the Healthy South Texas. The funders had no role in the design of the study; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; and in writing the manuscript.”
3. In the Availability of data and materials subsection please clarify from whom the data and materials may be requested.

Response: We really appreciate your comments. The corresponding author (Dr. Genny Carrillo) will be able to provide the data and materials when requested. We included this information in the section.

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 colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript.

Reviewer reports:

Leslie Allsopp, MSN, MPH (Reviewer 1): General Comment: The manuscript has been strengthened by the authors careful attention and the revisions made.

Conclusions: In this revision, the authors have made changes that bring their conclusion in line with the evidence provided in the study. As a discretionary consideration, I would recommend caution with respect to the statement (page 16 line 20) that: "as a result decreased asthma triggers in their household." While it is surely plausible that asthma triggers were decreased in the home, I do not know that measurements were made that would allow attribution of intervention benefits to specific program components, whether asthma triggers, medication compliance, etc.

Response: Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. Your comments were addressed as follows: “as a result they are more aware of the asthma triggers that could be in their household and learn several ways to prevent them”
Writing:

The corrections that have been made have improved the written quality of the manuscript. However, there are minor edits that I would recommend before publication. One example is line 2, page 2: "Childhood asthma is a significant health issue with prevalence 8.3% of in USA". This sentence appears in corrected form as the first sentence of the Background, line 2 page 4. There are corrections of a similar nature in the balance of the document. While they are few and minor, it would strengthen the manuscript to address them before publication.

Response: Thank you so much for your comments. Revision and a few edits to the entire document were completed.

As a discretionary consideration, the readability of table 2 could be improved, perhaps by increasing spacing between rows.

Response: Thank you very much for your comment. We modified the tables according to your suggestion.

Reviewer 2 had no corrections.

Rajen Naidoo (Reviewer 3):

This is an interesting study, with useful findings. The authors have adequately responded to the points raised by the previous review. I have only two minor suggestions to make:

There is likely that a selection bias occurred given the large number of non-participants. This needs to be addressed in the Discussion, and its likely effect on the findings. This leads to my next comment: Although on two outcomes (asthma attacks and family emotional support) were statistically significant, is it possible that either the selection bias or the sample size influenced these outcomes? Is it possible to show some sample size or power calculations? I believe that these are important outcomes, and knowing whether there is truly no effect will provide a better understanding of this intervention.
Response: Thank you very much for your comments. As you mentioned, a lot of non-participants may cause a selection bias but we cannot control this issue since people were supposed to voluntarily participate in the study. As we mentioned in the methods section, most of non-participants said that they thought their children’ health were controlled, they already knew about asthma well, or they did not have time due to work. Instead, we tried to minimize the selection bias by randomly and blindly assigning the schools of children to two groups and obtaining high completion rates from both groups. In addition, we had a substantial sample size (n=290). The information about this potential bias was included in the discussion section (page 15, lines 8-12).

My other minor comment is to please reflect the abbreviations used in Table 2 and 3 in the footnotes of the table.

Response: We really appreciate your comment. Changes were completed based on your suggestions.