Author's response to reviews

Title: Discriminative ability of the generic - and condition specific Child Oral Impacts on Daily Performances (OIDP)- the Limpopo - Arusha school health project (LASH): A cross-sectional study

Authors:

Hawa S Mbawalla (hawa.mbawalla@student.uib.no)
Matilda Mtaya (matilda.mtaya@student.uib.no)
Joyce R Masalu (jmasalu@muhas.ac.tz)
Pongsri Brudvik (pongsri.brudvik@odont.uib.no)
Anne N Astrom (anne.nordrehaug@cih.uib.no)

Version: 2 Date: 4 March 2011

Author's response to reviews: see over
Review of MS 1588505809504050
 Discriminative ability of the generic- and condition specific Child OIDP- results from the Limpopo - Arusha school health project (LASH): A cross-sectional study

Reviewer 1.
1. In Arusha 95% of the participants were in the age range 12-17 yr, whereas in dar es salaam the age range was 12-14 yr (see correction in the abstract)

2. Corrected to OIDP>0
3) reference corrected

Reviewer 2
1) To reflect the whole purpose in the title will make this title very long. We believe the title in its correct form reflect the content of the paper
2) Some modifications have been made to the result section of the abstract to make it more easy to read and in accordance with the recommendations.
3) This sentence in the background section has been rewritten. See corrected ms – page 4
4) Religious affiliation was included in the socio-demographics as previous studies from this area have shown variation in various health indicators across the various religious groups.
5) Number of individuals included in the test retest in the two sites have been included.
6) The reason why CS OIDP was only analyzed in dar es salaam and not in Arusha is simply that in the study in Arusha this aspect of OIDP was not measured. See information provided at page 9.
7) Yes – the various forms of administering the questionnaire across sites creates doubts and we have tried to discuss this in the discussion part of the paper.
8) The result section pertaining to Table 2 is long – but most of its information is not to be found in the table (as indicated in the text). For the description of the results in the other tables small modifications have been done.
9) Discussion- the results should be interpreted in light of possible limitations of the study as mentioned in the text see page 17-18