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Author's response to reviews:

Psychometric properties of Greek versions of the Modified Corah Dental Anxiety Scale (MDAS) and the Dental Fear Survey (DFS) [Note new title]

Reply to the reviewers’ comments on the revision

Once again, we thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions on our revision. With a few exceptions (described below), we have adopted their suggestions. All changes in this revision are in italics.

Perhaps the greatest change in this revision is that we have removed the material pertaining to the dentists’ ratings of the patient cooperation during dental treatment. While this validation method has been used in assessing children’s dental fear questionnaires, we agree with both reviewers who stated or implied that this method seems out of place in a report on adult dental fear questionnaires (at least without further explication as to why we would believe that cooperation is related to fear). This change results in a shortening of Table 2, as well as the elimination of what had been the 5th paragraph in the Discussion (which one of the reviewers had criticized for other reasons).

I will cover the remaining comments in order:

Once reviewer suggested that we paginate this revision, and we have done so.

This reviewer also asked that we move the details about score ranges of the measures from Background to Methods, and we have done so.

This reviewer also caught our mistake of leaving the author’s name inside the brackets of one reference.

As requested, we have shortened the description of Table 2 in the text so that it
is not redundant with the information in the Table itself.

We have also changed the description of the dental student sample to state how many were approached. We also shortened the decimal points of their age statistics to match those given for the private practice sample.

This reviewer also asked us to use a consistent style in the Results section to describe ranges, and further requested that it be the journal style. I first tried to find inconsistencies in my reporting of ranges in the section. Not finding any, I then reviewed the 2008 articles of BMC Oral Health available on-line, and found 6 papers which reported ranges (not including another paper in which I am first author). Three of these papers used the wording “range x – y”, which is the style I have used in this manuscript. The other three papers used the following wording: “range of x – y”, “between x and y”, and “x to y”. Since there appears to be some variation in how other authors describe ranges, and since the style I used appears to be that which most of the other authors have chosen, I suspect that I have misunderstood the reviewer’s comments. I look forward to a clarification of this point.

As noted above, the 5th paragraph has been eliminated.

Also as noted above, the material on cooperation has been eliminated.

The reviewer suggested a modification in the reporting of the results for gender. We have made the change, and made a similar change for the next reported statistics, as they also refer to gender.

This reviewer also suggested a change for the opening sentence of the 4th paragraph of the Discussion, and we have made the change.

Finally, this reviewer pointed out that Reference 28 could include additional information (rather than simply “in press”), as that paper had subsequently been available on-line. This reference is now in print, so we have changed the citation to include year, volume, and page information.

The other reviewer suggested some minor changes of wording on pages 4 (“situations”) and 5 (“range”), and we have made these.

This reviewer also suggested moving the internal consistency results (p. 10) to a new paragraph, and we have done so.

This reviewer also suggested that we add the dentists’ anxiety ratings to Table 1, and we have added extra rows to show the summary statistics for these participants. We also simplified the pertinent paragraph in Results so that it was not merely a restating of these statistics in the text.

This reviewer also suggested creating a new table with the test-retest information. We have decided not to do so, primarily because the data from the first administration are already displayed in Table 3. Instead, we hope that the text description of the test-retest results can stand on its own.
Also, as noted above, we have agreed with this reviewer's suggestion to remove the material about the cooperation ratings.

Finally, as the paper presents information and results about the MDAS first, followed by the DFS, we have changed the order of wording in the title to be consistent with this.