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The Editor
BMC Oral Health

Dear Dr Morawska

We re-submit the manuscript of our article “The potential of the Child Health Utility 9D Index as an outcome measure for child dental health.” for consideration for publication in BMC Oral Health. We have considered and revised the paper.

Response to the Reviewers

I would like to thank both reviewers for their suggestions and any changes have been included in red font.

Reviewer 1. Yvonne Blair

1. We have amended the title as you suggested to include the word ‘potential’ so now reads as “The potential of the Child Health Utility 9D Index as an outcome measure for child dental health.”
2. Thank you for your comments.
3. The two dental therapists who undertook the dental examinations were calibrated by an experienced examiner, although no inter- or intra-examiner reliability was undertaken. We are undertaking a much larger study and this will be incorporated into the design.
4. I have changed Table 1. 2 and 4. So as consistent with Table 3. as suggested by the reviewer.
5. and 6. Thank you for your comments.

Reviewer 2. Leonard Crocombe

1. We have spelt out what HRQoL stands for in the Abstract background section and removed it from the methods section as suggested.
2. We have defined what d3 means as suggested by the reviewer and added in brackets (clinically detectable lesions into dentine)
3. Thank you for your suggestion but we believe that Table 1. adds important socio-demographic characteristics and we have only highlighted certain aspects in the results section.
4. We do indicate in the paper that CHU9D was lower in children without apparent caries and that this was not significant. We have taken your suggestion re clarity of this point and removed the sentence in the results. We believe the sentence in the discussion explains or suggests some of the reasons that this observation occurred.

5. We have amended the authors contribution line as suggested b the reviewer.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely
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