Author's response to reviews

Title: Parental attitudes towards male human papillomavirus vaccination: a pan-European cross-sectional survey

Authors:

   Gitte Lee Mortensen (glm@anthroconsult.dk)
   Marjorie Adam (MAdam@spmsd.com)
   Laila Idtaleb (laila.idtaleb@ipsos.com)

Version: 5 Date: 23 September 2014

Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for your latest comments. Below, you will find our point-by-point response, and in the manuscript, the consequent changes are marked using the ‘track changes’ function. We hope that this revision accommodates your requirements and will be looking forward to hearing from you again.

On behalf of the authors,

With kind regards

Gitte Lee Mortensen

----------------------------------------------------------

Editor's comments:

In Point-by-point response to review as per 29.07.2014 they stated "The last paragraph of Methods has been rephrased as follows: 'Factorial Correspondence analysis using SPAD software was carried out on questions regarding main reasons for parents to accept, reject or have doubts about HPV vaccination of their sons to examine the key variables, drivers and barriers to male HPV vaccination. The contingency analysis of main reasons for parents to accept, reject or have doubts about HPV vaccination did not show any significant correspondence between variables with a coefficient correlation from -0.074 to 0.410 out of a maximum of 1.'" The last sentence ( "The contingency analysis of main reasons for parents to accept, reject or have doubts about HPV vaccination did not show any significant correspondence between variables with a coefficient correlation from -0.074 to 0.410 out of a maximum of .") should be relocated to result section and add a statement "data not shown".

We have relocated the last paragraph of Methods to the Result section and added the statement “data not shown”
They stated "These sentences in Methods (5th paragraph) has been rephrased as follows: "Significant statistical differences were performed with a 95% confidence interval". Instead they should report "Statistical significance defined as a conventional P value of <0.05".

We have deleted the sentence "Significant statistical differences were performed with a 95% confidence interval" and rephrased as follow: "Statistical significance defined as a conventional P value of <0.05".

Please delete this sentence because it was wrong "In the following 6th paragraph, we have inserted the following: 'To further explain main reasons for parents to accept, reject or have doubts about HPV vaccination, contingency analysis was then carried out to determine if some of the stated reasons referred with statistical significance to the same dimension depending on the coefficient correlation value." (correlation coefficient analysis is not a contingency analysis).

We agree and have deleted the sentence: "To further explain main reasons for parents to accept, reject or have doubts about HPV vaccination, contingency analysis was then carried out to determine if some of the stated reasons referred with statistical significance to the same dimension depending on the coefficient correlation value."

The editor requirement [" In addition the results of the contingency tables show for each bivariate table more than one p-values(for country and sex table five for example). The chi-squared statistic test gives an only p-value which test the overall independency in the distribution among the two variables, analyzing whether there is a significant difference between the expected frequencies under assumption of independency among variables and the observed frequencies in one or more categories "] and referee comment [" please explain why are there several p-values in each rows and what does each p-value indicate" and "Please explain what does p-value indicate here, and put them into a separate row/column"] was not correctly understand. It is enough one p value to test if there were significant differences between the expected frequencies under assumption of independency among two variables. (for example gender and nationality). It was provide some tables to example what the referee mean.

In the tables, there is more than one p-value because we compared one country with another. So, you have a chi-squared statistic test for each. For country and gender table for example, you have in UK 3 p-values:
- P<0.001 (vs. 11%) for UK vs. Italy
- P<0.001 (vs. 20%) for UK vs. France
- P<0.001 (vs. 23%) for UK vs. Germany

To make it easier to read, we have added a new column with P-value description.