

Author's response to reviews

Title: Lower energy expenditures in infants from obese biological mothers

Authors:

Russell Rising (Russell_rising@yahoo.com)

Fima Lifshitz (DrLfshtz@aol.com)

Version: 3 **Date:** 2 May 2008

Author's response to reviews: see over

Responses to reviewer #1 (Maciej Buchowski for version #2)

General comments:

We thank this reviewer again for his/her helpful criticisms. We have addressed the following general comments as follows:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. In accordance with the reviewer we eliminated the first three lines on page 12, paragraph 2. However, we felt the rest of the text should remain since it is really not suitable to be placed under the “brief discussion of the EMTAC” as written in the Methods section of the manuscript.
2. As suggested by the reviewer, we shortened the paragraph describing breastfeeding as found originally on Page 13, Paragraph #2.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. In regard to the Tables, we feel that ranges are not necessary. This will just add more numbers to what is already there and crowd the tables, thus making it difficult for the reader. A lot of manuscripts just include the Standard Deviation.
2. In agreement with the reviewer, we did combine lines #1 and 3# of Table 1 as suggested.
3. In regards to the equations in Table #2. We added text on Page 8, Line #5. This just says that we utilized the metabolic data from the 21 infants in this study to derive the equations.
4. In regards to the origin of the oscillations/min referred to throughout the manuscript. We now include a description of this on Page 7, line #1 of the Methods section.

Discretionary Revisions

Conclusions: We changed the conclusions according to the reviewer’s suggestion and moved the last sentence to the last line of the Discussion section.

Title: We disagree with the reviewer and feel our current title is appropriate.

Introduction: We made the changes according to the reviewer’s suggestions.

Discussion: We made the changes as suggested by the reviewer.

Figure 2: We double checked the data and it turns out that two points are so close together, it is hard to see them separately. We slightly changed the size of the data points to solve the problem.

Responses to reviewer #2 (James Delany for version #2)

General comments:

We thank this reviewer again for his helpful criticisms. We have addressed the following general comments as follows:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. We agree with the reviewer that there was a problem with at least a partial explanation for the lower 24 hour energy expenditure in infants from obese mothers. We now add some additional explanation for this beginning on Page 11, Line #17. We also added a reference to this effect (new #28). We also provide some explanation for this from the results of our two previous 24-hour metabolic studies (Refs #7 and #14). In regards to physical activity, it is possible the small number of infants in each group might have prevented us from detecting subtle differences in physical activity among the three groups.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. We apologize for misinterpreting the work by Roberts et al, 1988. We have corrected this in the Introduction section of the manuscript.
2. In regards to the indirect calorimetry system used in the Wells study, two major problems still remain. This includes lack of the ability to interact with the infant during testing and the fact that the sleeping metabolic rate measurement is still only one hour. There could be periods during the measurement where the infant is restless due to lack of attention from the mother. This might be the reason for such a short duration of measurement. We have published (Refs #14 and 21) that at least 4-hours are needed for a valid measurement of daily energy expenditure and its components.
3. We corrected the FFM formula as suggested by the reviewer.
4. We just eliminated reference to the balance by Figure 1. Since the second reviewer asked us to eliminate part of this figure, this also eliminated the picture of the balance. We just describe it in the Methods section of the manuscript.
5. We made the changes in the text as suggested by the reviewer.
6. We made the changes in the text as suggested by the reviewer.