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Dear Editor of BMC Medicine,

We are pleased to re-submit our revised manuscript entitled: “Two distinct do-not-resuscitate protocols leaving less to the imagination: an observational study using propensity score matching”, for consideration as a research article. We thank the statistical reviewer for his comments and suggestions on the statistics we used in this manuscript.

In this version of the manuscript, we have done some work to revise our manuscript following the statistical reviewer’s comments and suggestions. We also provided a point-to-point response to the statistical reviewer in the following pages.

This revised manuscript has not been previously published and is not under consideration in the same or substantially similar form in any other journals. To the best of our knowledge, no conflict of interest exists. This study was partly supported by a research grant from Taiwan Ministry of Science and Technology (NSC 101-2511-S-002-007). This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board in MetroHealth Medical Center (IRB07-01218).

Best Regards,

Correspondence Author
Shan-Chwen Chang, M.D., Ph.D.
Department of Internal Medicine, National Taiwan University College of Medicine
Address: No.1, Rd. Ren-Ai sec. 1, Chong-Cheng District, Taipei, 100, Taiwan
To the Statistical Reviewer, Dr. Joseph Massaro

Dear Dr. Massaro,

Thank you for your comments on our statistics. Our point-to-point responses to your comments are as follows:

<Major Compulsory Revisions>

1. Thank you for the references you provided regarding standardized differences. We followed your suggestions to show standardized differences of each variable in Table 2, Table 4, Supplementary Table 3, and Supplementary Table 4. We also indicated how we examined whether each variable is balanced using Student’s t-test/Chi-squared test and standardized difference in the last paragraph of the “Methods” section.

<Minor Essential Revisions>

1. We followed your suggestions to clearly point out “greedy matching” and “no caliber” in the third section of the “Propensity Score Matching” subsection (highlighted by yellow).

2. We presented the medians and percentiles of each continuous variable in Supplementary Table 1.

We would like to thank you for your effort in statistical review of our study. By following your suggestions to review the references and to revise our manuscript, we further polish our ability of conducting propensity score matching. We hope that the current version of this revised manuscript is suitable for publication in this journal.