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Author's response to reviews:

To
The Editor
BMC Public Health

Respected Sir,

Kindly accept the revised article for further review. Corrections have been made as advised. Hope you will find the revised form acceptable for your journal.

Thanks in advance

Yours faithfully

Dr Asim Saha
Senior Research Officer (Medical)
National Institute of Occupational Health, INDIA

Answer to Reviewer's report

(All the changes made in the manuscript have been done in italics so that they can be identified easily)

Title: Effectiveness of different methods of health education: A comparative assessment in a scientific conference.

Major Compulsory Revisions

In order to understand the implications of this research, the authors need to provide more details about the conference at which these interviews were conducted.

Taken care of. More details of the conference are included in the methods section.

They need to provide several specific examples of the types of presentations that they describe and offer comments as to why some of them worked better than others.

This inclusion also has been made carefully. Examples have been included in the methods section and comments on why some of them worked better than others have been included in the discussion section.

What message are we to take away from this paper?

Necessary corrections have been made in the last part of discussion section and also in the conclusion section.

They also need to provide a few more details about the statistical methods and how the multivariate analyses were carried out.

This correction has been made in the methods section.

Minor Essential Revisions
The tables seem pretty cultured with all the non-significant results in them. I would suggest just including those results that were statistically significant and saying in a footnote that the others were not statistically significant.

Taken care of.