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December 10, 2013

Dear Dr. Christopher Foote:

Please find enclosed a copy of our revised manuscript entitled, “Dental health behavior of parents of children using non-fluoride toothpaste: a cross-sectional study” which we would like to resubmit for publication in *BMC Oral Health*.

We wish to thank the reviewers for their careful critique of our revised manuscript. We have made every effort to implement their recommendations, and we feel that the paper has been improved as a result. The revised parts were highlighted with blue. We hope you will find the manuscript suitable for publication in your journal.

Sincerely,

Tatsuo Yamamoto
Department of Dental Sociology,
Kanagawa Dental University Graduate School of Dentistry,
82 Inaoka-cho, Yokosuka,
Kanagawa 238-8580, Japan
TEL & FAX: +81 46 822 8838
e-mail: yamamoto.tatsuo@kdu.ac.jp

**Response to reviewer 1**
The manuscript was modified.
The reviewer thinks the manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Our reply: Thank you for your comments. Our manuscript has been improved according to your comments.

**Response to reviewer 2**
The authors gave good answers to my comments and improved the manuscript.
Our reply: Thank you for your comments. Our manuscript has been improved according to your comments.

**Response to reviewer 3**
Major concern was that their results have been completely changed, compared with the previous version. All of the changed or added texts should be highlighted in blue.
In particular, Tables 2 and 3 have been done so.
For example, approximately 10 items including "recommendation of friends or acquaintances" have been deleted from Tables 2 and 3.
Why did they have deleted them? This makes me confused. More careful explanation is needed for further review.
Our reply: Thank you for your comments. We have highlighted all the changes in text, tables and figure in blue.
We have changed the results according to the reviewer 2’s comments. The reviewer 2 concerned low percentage of “yes” answer (comment #12) and many variables for Question 5 and Question 6. To address the reviewer’s concern, we reduced the
number of variables. As a result, Questions with less than 10% of yes or no answers (reason for toothpaste selection (Question 5) and behavior to prevent caries (Question 6)) were excluded from the analyses. During the process of reducing variables, "recommendation of friends or acquaintances" was deleted from the analyses. Following are the reviewer 2’s comments and our responses, which are related to the reviewer 3’s concerns.

Reviewer 2’s comments:
Analysis:
#12. For “measure against oral malodor” and “contains salt” you had only 43 and 42 times “yes”. Why did you add these variables in the multilevel model?
Our reply: Thank you for your comments. We have removed the variable from the analyses (Tables 2 and 3).

Reviewer 2’s comments:
#13. For question 5 you have 16 possible answers. Did you consider the possibility to do a Factor analysis to find domains?
Our reply: We could not apply factor analysis because the data was yes (1) or no (0). Instead, we reduced the number of variables taking into account the reviewer’s comment #12. Questions with less than 10% of yes or no answers (reason for toothpaste selection (Question 5) and behavior to prevent caries (Question 6)) were excluded from the analyses. We have added an explanation on page 8, lines 14-16.

Reviewer 2’s comments:
Results:
#15. It would give a better insight in the results, if Table 2 and 3 should be combined. The 95% confidence interval in Table 2 could be removed and the odds ratio, 95% confidence interval and p could be added. It is better to use the word p-value in the table instead of p.
Our reply: Thank you for your comments. The 95% confidence intervals in Table 2 were removed and “p” was replaced with “p-value” in Tables 2 and 3, according to the reviewer’s comments. However, we feel that the information may be too complicated for readers to understand if Tables 2 and 3 are combined.