

Author's response to reviews

Title: The diagnostic work up of growth failure in secondary health care; An evaluation of consensus guidelines.

Authors:

Floor K Grote (f.k.grote@lumc.nl)
Wilma Oostdijk (w.oostdijk@lumc.nl)
Sabine MPF De Muinck Keizer-Schrama
(s.demuinckkeizer-schrama@erasmusmc.nl)
Paula van Dommelen (paulavandommelen@tno.nl)
Stef van Buuren (stef.vanbuuren@tno.nl)
Friedo W Dekker (f.w.dekker@lumc.nl)
Arnoldus G Ketel (arnoldusketel@hotmail.com)
Henriette A Moll (h.a.moll@erasmusmc.nl)
Jan Maarten M Wit (j.m.wit@lumc.nl)

Version: 2 **Date:** 20 March 2008

Author's response to reviews: see over

Dear mister H. Zauner,

Hereby we would like to resubmit our manuscript, entitled “The diagnostic work up of growth failure in secondary health care; An evaluation of consensus guidelines” for publication in the BMC pediatrics. First of all we would like to thank Barbara Starland and Gary Butler for their careful reading and their valuable advices. We have tried to change the manuscript as requested.

We would like to thank you for giving us the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript. We hope you’ll reconsider our revised manuscript for publication.

With kind regards,
On behalf of all authors

Floor K. Grote, MD, PhD

Commentary in detail:

Commentary by Barbara Starfield

1. Delete the first clause in the second sentence of the “ Background”

We agree that the first clause of the sentence is not essential for the abstract as the referral to secondary health care is not the main subject of interest and can be seen as a part of the diagnostic workup. We have therefore deleted the clause as requested.

2. Re-word the last sentence of the Methods as follows:.....to determine the characteristics of children.....

We changed the last sentence as recommended.

3. The first sentence of Results needs to be changed to.....

This change makes the sentence more logical. Thank you for pointing this out to us.

4. Replace first sentence of Conclusion with:

We formulated the conclusion as requested.

Please explain why more workups should be done.....

The yield in this study (5%) was indeed what was expected and is at least required in new guidelines, however as the diagnostic work-up reported in our study was carried out incompletely in most cases we were not able to construct an evidence-based decision rule for the general diagnostic work-up in children with short stature at this point. Further research is therefore necessary to find evidence. Moreover it is known from previous studies that the DCG leads to too many referrals. Therefore new guidelines are needed with a better sensitivity and specificity, in which target height should play a more prominent role and the implementation process receives more attention.

Commentary by Gary Butler:

We slightly changed the lay-out of table 5 and added some words to the heading in order to clarify the table. We hope the changes are satisfactory.