

Author's response to reviews

Title: Neuropsychological effects of chronic low-dose exposure to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs): A cross-sectional study

Authors:

Martin Peper (peper@psychologie.uni-freiburg.de)

Martin Klett (martin.klett@rhein-neckar-kreis.de)

Rudolf Morgenstern (rudolf.morgenstern@charite.de)

Version: 4 **Date:** 6 October 2005

Author's response to reviews: see over

Prof. Dr. Dr. Martin Peper
University of Freiburg
Department of Psychology
Biological and Differential Psychology Section
Belfortstr. 20
79085 Freiburg
Germany

Phone: ++49 (0) 761 / 203-3024
Fax: ++49 (0) 761 / 203-3023
Email: peper@psychologie.uni-freiburg.de

PROF. DR. DR. M. PEPER • Institut für Psychologie • D-
79085 Freiburg

To the
Managing Editor of
Environmental Health
BioMed Central Ltd
Middlesex House
34-42 Cleveland Street
London W1T 4LB

United Kingdom

Prof. Dr. Rudolf Morgenstern
Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin
Institute of Pharmacology and Toxicology
Dorotheenstr. 94
10117 Berlin
Germany

Phone: ++49 (0) 30 / 450-525-211
Fax: ++49 (0) 30 / 450-525-919

06/10/2005

**Re: Ms Martin Peper, Martin Klett, and Rudolf Morgenstern:
Neuropsychological effects of chronic low-dose exposure to polychlorinated biphenyls
(PCB): A cross-sectional study**

Dear Dr. Grandjean,
dear Dr. Ozonoff,

please find the response to your comments below. Most changes were done as suggested. If further changes are necessary, please contact me. We hope that this version will meet with your and the reviewers' approval. Thank you again for spending your time on this ms!

Yours sincerely,

Martin Peper, PhD MD
encl ms

Response to Comments

The title needs to indicate the type of study: changed.

For the sake of uniform presentation, decimal values should be expressed the same way (we prefer not to leave out the zero before the decimal point), and a couple of other similar changes are needed.

Zero before the decimal point changed in text and table footnotes. ²corrected.

We also prefer to say that the Bonferroni adjustment was the ‘revised’ version, and that the probability values were ‘adjusted’, rather than ‘corrected’. We have indicated the suggested changes and some additional comments in the attached track-changes version of your manuscript. Please go through all changes and comments and accept, reject, or revise as appropriate. Please make sure that the final version does not contain comments or track-changes indications.

Done, see below:

„A cross-sectional study“: accepted.

Omission of “From the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology (CCM), Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Dorotheenstr. 94, 10117 Berlin, Germany.” :

Since there is a dual affiliation of the first author, the actual affiliation of the present work remains unclear. Therefore, the dissertation committee of the Charité has strongly advised to name the affiliation with the CCM on the first page of the present work.

While a repetition of my personal affiliation on the bottom part of the title page is not necessary, the statement “From the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology (CCM), Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Dorotheenstr. 94, 10117 Berlin, Germany.” must be presented somewhere on the first page.

Adjusted significance: accepted

Bonferoni adjustment: accepted (nevertheless, “which was corrected for dependencies” sounds better to me because the adjustment itself was corrected for dependencies).

Corrected -> adjusted: accepted

Scree-Test = terminus technicus; rejected!

Attentional: accepted

All other changes accepted.

Comments:

d in abstract is now explicated as follows: “...moderate exposure effect size (d) relative to...”

lipids is highly_[pg1] prone to bias:

“Highly” is the original wording used by the authors, however, we might also use “potentially”.

Low chlorinated PCB: deleted and sentence modified.

...because a blind-value test did not separate PCB 52 samples from unexposed samples [pg2][29]. Do you mean that the quality assurance requirements failed for these analyses?

Yes. Suggested new explanation:

A PCB sum value was computed except PCB 52 because quality assurance requirements failed for this congener [29].