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Reviewer's report:

Dr Coolidge has made a good effort at revising the manuscript in line with the suggestions made by both reviewers. The paper reads well and the methodology and results are well described. Justification for the paper has been provided, which is nice to see. Unfortunately, some of these changes have created some additional issues which I list below. None of them are big, but I believe they are worth addressing. For the record, page numbers in the manuscript would greatly assist reviewers when referring to relevant sections of text.

Minor Essential Revisions

In the 'Background' section, you detail the score range of the two scales. First, this is not the place for this information. Second, you also have the same information in the Results already, so this is redundant. Any thought of putting this information in the Methods where such descriptions are normally to be found?

Second last para. in 'Background', authors' names should not be included in reference 22.

The third paragraph in the Results is entirely redundant and completely repeats the information in Table 2. I would suggest leaving Table 2 and just summarising the results in text.

"...approximately 100 patients were judged to be eligible..." sounds like you're not really sure. The exact number is needed here.

SD and median age in the Results could also be reported to 1 dp to match with the reported mean.

In the Results, you have used different styles to indicate a number range and this should be kept consistent with the journal style.

Discussion, 5th paragraph: no such thing as "highly significant", just "significant". Correlations can be 'high' according to established ranges, but not significances. Also, same paragraph, it should be noted that you did not conduct any statistical tests to determine if correlations were higher for anxiety ratings than for cooperation ratings. They ARE higher, but not necessarily higher at a statistical significance of 0.05.
Discretionary Revisions

A word or two on the dentists’ assessment of how cooperative the patient is would be useful. Readers should be given information on what insight this provides. Has cooperation been operationalised previously in this way? With adults? Link between cooperation and fear? Etc. Not a lot needed, but something.

In the first paragraph of the results, might I suggest: "...and 12.18 (5.11) for females, with the difference between males and females being statistically significant (t = 3.070, df = 135.72..."

4th para. of the Discussion ("The validity of these scales has...") would be better as "The validity of the MDAS and DFS has..." as the paragraph should stand as an independent thought.

Given that the Arapostathis et al. paper (Ref. 28) is now online early at the Int J Paediatr Dent, can you reference it via the DOI rather than leave it as "in press"?
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