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28/11/2017

Jane Fisher, PhD
Aleksandra Gentry-Maharaj, PhD
Marc Schwartz, PhD
Zephne van der Spuy, PhD
Editors-in-Chief, BMC Women’s Health
Dear Prof Fisher, Dr Gentry-Maharaj, Prof Schwartz and Prof van der Spuy,


Thank you for notifying me that on 27th October our paper was forwarded to the handling editor Dr Manuel Zorzi.

I am pleased to provide a further clean revised version of our paper after responding to your requests of 11/11/2017 as follows:

1) In your “ethical approval and consent to participate” section, please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in your manuscript. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure. If the need for consent was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.

We provide this information in our manuscript ‘Methods’ section on page 6. I have further emphasised the point that consent was given by virtue of the participant voluntarily completing the online survey. Additional formal consent is not required in the circumstance of our anonymous data collection. Ethical approval was granted for our consent process:

“HCPs who voluntarily accessed the survey, and completed and submitted it, did so in the knowledge that they were thereby giving consent for their anonymous responses to be included in the study. The participant information preface to the online survey explained these steps in the consent process and stated that since data was anonymous formal verbal or written consent was not required. The study was approved by UCL research ethics committee (project ID: 8053/002) and was open to participants for three months from March 2016”.

2) In order to be in line with journal requirements, please include the following headings within your manuscript: Background, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions

I have provided a ‘Background’ heading on page 3.

I have retained the ’Methods’ heading on p5 and omitted all sub-headings under this section i.e. procedure, materials, analysis, quantitative analyses, and qualitative analyses.

I have retained the ‘Results’ heading on p 9 and for ease of comprehension the 10 subheadings under this section.

I have retained the ‘Discussion’ heading p17.

I have retained the ‘Conclusion’ heading p23.
3) Please remove the cover letter from your supplementary files

Yes, done.

4) We would also like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of LF, LS, SG, JW, SS, MF, IJ, AL as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to the listed tasks alone, does not usually justify authorship.

Our research group follows the ICMJE guidelines for authorship and I confirm the intellectual contributions to this paper by:

“IJ conceived the PROMISE programme which included the Health Behaviour workstream within which this study was delivered. IJ provided intellectual input by appraising results. AL led the multidisciplinary Health Behaviour workstream of the PROMISE programme and was the Principal Investigator for the survey, designing it and overseeing its development, delivery, analysis and presentation of results. KH distributed the survey to professional healthcare organisations and performed the quantitative data analysis. KH and MF analysed the qualitative responses to free text questions. The Health Behaviour workstream scientists: LF, LS, SG, JW, SS, MF and KH all contributed to the development of the survey, the analysis plan, and appraisal of results. KH drafted the manuscript which all authors critically reviewed and approved”

I have uploaded a single clean version of our manuscript as requested. All relevant tables/figures/additional files I have also uploaded as clean versions. Figures (and additional files) have been uploaded as separate files.

Thank you for your consideration of our work.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Anne Lanceley

Senior Lecturer
University College London