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Author's response to reviews: see over
HOW WE HAVE DEALT WITH THE CRITIQUE FROM THE REFEREES

First we will thank for inspiring and constructive critique. We hope that the way we have dealt with this critique clarifies the methodology and the analyses used in the paper and contribute to a more clearly connection between some of the topics introduced in the background session and the discussion part of the manuscript.

**Reviewer 1**

Reviewer 1 concluded that there isn’t any missing data or any type of mistake or deficiency to repair. However she underlines that it would have strengthened the study if it had been possible to distinguish the fathers/versus mothers response. This is mentioned as one of the limitations in the study. To underline this in a stronger way I added the following sentence (p 17)

“According to other studies [30;31], it can be assumed that different cross-informant results might be found on the different subscales between children and their mothers, or between children and their fathers. It would have strengthened the study if it had been possible to distinguish the fathers/versus mothers responses regarding both boys and girls”

**Reviewer 2**

1. Method description

Method description is not clear and precise. For example, when describing the use of the logistic regression there is no indication of what dichotomic variable(s) was or were used and how that/those was or were extracted by the original data.

We agree that the description of the logistic regression lacks clear information about the different exploratory variables used in the analyses. Of that reason I have rewritten the last part of the section on Statistical methods (p 8-9).

The exploratory variables school grade/ age and communication were used as continuous variables. Income and education level were recoded as semi-continuous variables (OR expressed the differences in risk when income decreased by approximately €12.500 and when education level decreased by one year of education). The other variables (gender, parental status, parents’ nationality and parental engagement) were used as categorical variables.

To increase the readability of table 4 the reference alternatives (OR=1) for the dichotomic variables gender, parental status and nationality were omitted. For the variable parental engagement which has four answer alternatives the indicator alternative is marked in the table as (ref)

There is also a lack of information (for example confidence intervals etc.) on this analysis results.
Confidence intervals and level of statistic significance of the results were reported for all OR results in table 4, both for the univariate and the multivariate analyses.

2. Discussion

There are some topics which were not introduced in previous parts of the paper.

Unfortunately, the reviewer has not exemplified which these topics are.
May be she addresses the discussion on the reporting style of Scandinavian parents and children.
In the background session I refer in a more general way to earlier research that has shown that cultural aspects can be a possible factor contributing to parent-child disagreement (p4).
To link my discussion on Scandinavian parents and adolescents to this point in the introduction I have added the reference on cross-cultural studies [26] in the background session (now reference 15) (p.4).

In the discussion session I also discuss a possible connection between poor agreement on conduct problems and the construct validity of the SDQ, using a new reference [29] (p.16).
In the method session, I describe the SDQ (p 6-7), mentioning that Cross-cultural research has shown sound psychometric properties.
To link the topic of construct validity in the discussion to the background session, I have added “despite modest levels of internal reliability for several subscales”. I also added the reference used in the discussion part (now reference 24).

3. Abstract

The authors mention in the abstract that gender is a predictor of disagreement between children and parents. The question is gender of whom (parents or children)? It is necessary to read accurately the paper in order to make an educated guess on the interpretation of the abstract.
We agree that we must communicate more clearly that the gender of the child is a predictor of disagreement. To clarify this, we added “of the child” in the description of the results ….. qualitative aspects of the parent-child relationship and family structure seemed to be more powerful predictors of disagreement than were the gender of the child and socio-demographic variables. When parents reported……….low income and male gender of the child played an additional role.

Other changes in the manuscript


is changed to

**Editorial requests:**

1. **Ethical approval**

The study was conducted after approval from the Regional Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics. This wasn’t mentioned in the manuscript. The ethical approval is now addressed in the Methods section, (paragraph on subjects, p6).

2. **Copyediting**

The Microsoft Word template has been used to generate the BMC Psychiatry style and create the manuscript in the standard format.

To improve the style of written English the manuscript has been copyedited by OnLine English proofreading and editorial service. This service offers scientific and academic editing and specializes in providing an English correction and improvement service for authors whose native language is not English.

3. **Highlighting of all changes**

When revising the manuscript all changes are been coloured.