

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Paediatrics Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Why health information needs to be accessible to all
AUTHORS	Waterston, Tony; Pakenham Walsh, Neil

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Professor Richard Walker Institution and Country: Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, UK Competing interests: I know Tony Waterston as medical education colleague and I am a member of HIFA.
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Aug-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is an excellent editorial in which the authors justify why information needs to be more accessible, especially in low and middle income countries, and provide a description about how CHIFA has helped to achieve this. They also highlight future opportunities. As someone with an interest in Global Health, and a member of HIFA myself, I admire what has been achieved with, as the authors say, relatively little funding. My only suggestion to improve the manuscript is to put UK after Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Professor Angel A Escobedo Institution and Country: Academic Paediatric Hospital "Pedro Borrás", Microbiology and Parasitology Competing interests: There is not conflicts of interest to declare.
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Aug-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for this nice editorial article that highlights and puts nicely into context the important issue of the universal access to information. It also introduce the readers into the "CHIFA: Child Healthcare Information For All", its main activities and future opportunities to expand the network and broaden its work ad the invitation to join this initiative.</p> <p>I think this is an acceptable and important issue to follow up with, and should be of interest to the readers of BMJ Paediatrics open.</p> <p>I have only one suggestion and its to check the way the references are quoted in the manuscript. For instance, reference 2 appears first, and reference 1 after.</p> <p>In the text, I did not find reference 3.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

In response to referee 1, we have added UK after Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health

In response to referee 2, we have updated the references so that all are cited in the reference list and in the correct order.

In relation to the associate editor, we have included all websites and references in the reference section and have re numbered so that there are now eight references. All alterations may be seen as track changes.