

## **Author's response to reviews**

**Title:** Dietary intakes in infertile women, a pilot study

### **Authors:**

Ottavia Colombo ([ottavia.colombo@unipv.it](mailto:ottavia.colombo@unipv.it))  
Giovanna Pinelli ([giovanna.pinelli@unipv.it](mailto:giovanna.pinelli@unipv.it))  
Mario Comelli ([mario.comelli@unipv.it](mailto:mario.comelli@unipv.it))  
Pierpaolo Marchetti ([pierpaolo.marchetti@unipv.it](mailto:pierpaolo.marchetti@unipv.it))  
Sabina Sieri ([sieri@istitutotumori.mi.it](mailto:sieri@istitutotumori.mi.it))  
Furio Brighenti ([furio.brighenti@univr.it](mailto:furio.brighenti@univr.it))  
Rossella E Nappi ([renappi@tin.it](mailto:renappi@tin.it))  
Anna Tagliabue ([anna.tagliabue@unipv.it](mailto:anna.tagliabue@unipv.it))

**Version:** 3 **Date:** 2 October 2009

**Author's response to reviews:** see over

*Dear Editorial Board,*

*We are puzzled because Referee 1 considers the article of importance in its field and recommends publication; on the contrary Referee 2 does not understand the purpose of our study. We understand from Referee 1 assessment that it is not necessary to modify the paper. However taking into consideration Referee 2 comments and the Editorial Board observation we have clarified the purpose of the study in the text and in the title. We have prepared a revised version and a point-by-point response only to Referee 2 because Referee 1 seems completely satisfied with the new version of our paper. We now hope that the paper is acceptable for publication,*

## **Referee 2**

Major comment:

Unfortunately, the authors did not revise appropriately to the questions raised. The most important problem, which still exists, is that the purpose of the study is unclear: whether to compare something between HA and PCOS groups or to find psychological variables related to underreporting of energy intake. The title says That the purpose is the latter. But the result was stated very briefly only in the text (neither in tables nor in figures). The analysis was very rough without any consideration of confounding factors. In the authors' reply, they said that they had two purposes. If so, the analyses were too rough and too careless for both purposes. As a consequence, they failed to give any answers to both questions raised by themselves because of the rough analyses.

*We apologize for not interpreting adequately the issues put forward by Referee n° 2. We have changed the last paragraph of the introduction in order to clarify better the main purpose of the study which was :*

*...“the purpose of our study was to assess the nutritional status in young infertile women without clinically overt eating disorders, comparing dietary habits and body composition in two different types of infertility: PCOS and hypothalamic amenorrhea”*

*See page 5 lines 5 - 11*

*We have changed the abstract (See: Pag 2 lines 3 – 6), discussion ( see pag 14 lines 2-4) and Title accordingly.*

*The statistical analyses were planned according to this purpose.*

*However we considered relevant to this purpose to include the psychological profile in the assessment as it is suggested by recent literature on dietary surveys. As the study of the influence of psychological variables on underreporting was not the main purpose, the results on this item are stated very briefly*