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Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to re-submit the manuscript after amendments, following reviewers comments. Response to the two reviewers comments is listed below.

Reviewer's report 1
Version: 1 Date: 7 June 2013
Reviewer: Mirjam Elisabeth Johanna van Beelen

Reviewer's report:
The paper is well-written and clear to understand. It is a good starting point in order to look at interventions effective to reduce childhood injuries.

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
None

• Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1. In the method section of the abstract, the last sentence ends abruptly. Probably a few words are missing.
   *The extra wording of ‘of the’ has been deleted*

2. In the results section of the abstract, change mothers into mothers’.
   *Apostrophe has been added.*

3. In the background section, the authors state the following: parental lack of... significant barrier to change... To change what? Please define.
   *The word ‘change’ has been omitted and the barrier has been defined.*

4. In the study aims section, change mothers decisions in mothers’ decisions
   *Apostrophe has been added.*

5. The provision of informed consent is stated in the method section and in the results section. I suppose it should only be in the method section.
   *Informed consent has been removed from the results section and added to the methods section.*

6. Where the interviews took place should be in the method section.
   *The place of interview has been removed from the results section and added to the methods section*
7. The study aim is defined differently in the abstract and the study aim after the background section. I am not quite sure whether they mean the same. Please define one study aim and make sure that it is the same throughout the paper. 
*The study aim in the abstract and the study aim within the paper have been modified to show the same objective.*

8. In the method section, the authors state that mothers were questioned about their use of five safety devices and six practice. Which devices and practices were asked? And to which types of injury prevention (for example prevention of falls, poisoning, drowning, or burns) did they apply? 
*The safety devices and practices shown to mothers has been incorporated in the paper and is referred to in figure 1. A further sentence has been added to refer to the types of injury prevention covered.*

9. In the results section the authors speak of recent arrivals to the UK (seven years or less). Where was this definition based on? I wonder this because in the abstract the authors talk about mothers who were recent migrants had not always encountered safety messages or safety equipment commonly used in the UK. On the other hand mothers were recruited when they were pregnant, so they would have had plenty of time to get familiar with the safety equipment and messages in the UK? Seven years would be long enough? 
*The word ‘recent’ immigrant has been defined from a search in literature, however for the purpose of our study we have used seven years, as one of the mothers had been living in the UK up to this period during the research period. As regards to the second point that ‘mothers were recruited when they were pregnant, so they would have had plenty of time to get familiar with the safety equipment and messages in the UK? Seven years would be long enough?’, we conclude that there is a difference between knowing about safety equipment and actually using them. Secondly recent immigrant mothers may have missed or not come across government safety messages about safe use of household equipment, which mothers native to the UK would have come across growing up in the UK. Even then accidents continue to happen.*

10. Why do the authors report on preliminary findings and eventual findings? 
*The word ‘preliminary’ has been removed.*
11. Are first-time mothers different from mothers who have one child?
We find that first-time mothers and second-time mothers have different characteristics. *First time mothers are less experienced in terms of childcare, compared to mothers with more than one child.*

12. The conclusion from the abstract and the discussion do not seem to be in line with each other.
*This conclusion in the abstract has been revised in line with the discussion.*

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests

**Reviewer's report (2)**

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 15 July 2013

**Reviewer:** Kristin Roberts

**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question posed by the authors is well defined. There is a need for this information, which is well presented in the introduction.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Please reread the methods section in the abstract, specifically the last sentence appears to be cut off. The methods clearly explain the performed data collection.
*The extra words have been removed.*

3. Are the data sound? The sample size is low but acceptable for a focus group. The information presented is interesting and valuable to the field.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes, the methods are clear and the study could be replicated.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported
by the data? Yes, the authors expand on their results in the discussion.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

The authors understand the limitations of their study.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? I would have liked more explanation regarding suggested future studies, how and why could fathers be the next step?

Further suggestions have been included.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes, very clear.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests

Please feel free to contact me for any further changes that maybe required.

With very good wishes and thanks.

Yours sincerely

Ashra Khanom