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Author's response to reviews: see over
Author's Report
BioMed Central Editorial MS: 9757659961727464
A qualitative study of the views of adolescents on their caries risk and prevention behaviours.
Emma P Hall-Scullin, Joanna Goldthorpe, Keith Milsom and Martin Tickle

Following the comments made by the referees the following amendments have been made to the paper for submission:

Reviewers Report

Referee 1 Version 1 Date 23rd June 2015

• Discretionary Revisions
In the result# from the line 184 to the line 192,
It will be better to move this paragraph to the "Data analysis"
AMENDMENT: Paragraph moved (Line 216-224)

• Minor Essential Revisions
In Table 1, change the (SES) in another way of expressing, so that to distinguish it from the followed number of the "(actual recruited)"
AMENDMENT: Table 1: amended Socio-economic (SES) subheading to read IMDQ category. Amended subheading Upper SES to read IMDQ 1-3 and Lower SES to IMDQ 3-4. Deleted text Line 706.

Referee 2 Version: 1 Date: 2 July 2015

• Major Compulsory Revisions
Method
1/ Line 149- “The interviewer had received training in conducting semi-structured interviews”. By whom and what did this training involve?
AMENDMENT: The interviewer (EHS) attended training sessions in collecting qualitative interview data provided by Academic and Researcher Development, University of Manchester. This included multi-disciplinary interactive sessions (Line 158-160).
2/ In the data analyses section there needs to be some more description of the ‘framework approach’ i.e. how does it differ from other types of thematic analyses and the reason it was chosen for this study?
AMENDMENT: added detail of why framework method was chosen (Line 189-196)

3/ The term ‘theme saturation’ should be described in some more detail.
AMENDMENT: added detail (Line 206-209)

4/ How was data validity ensured? Was the issue of reflexivity addressed?
AMENDMENT: Sections on reflexivity (Line 226-236) and quality (Line 238-273) included and described in narrative where appropriate.

Results
5/ The IMDQ measure reported in table 3 needs to be explained in some more detail.
AMENDMENT: Added details of data collection of socio-demographic variables to methods. (Line 127-133). Abbreviation IMDQ explained (Line 643)

Discussion / Conclusion
6/ In the section ‘oral health for the future’, the comment made by respondent 5 (line 400-404) relates to the important health promotion concept of ‘making healthy choice the easy choices’ This should be discussed in some more depth in reference to the NHSP.
AMENDMENT: discussed how NHSP relates to “making healthier choices easier” in discussion (Line 555-557)

7/ Line 464 “advice provided by the dental team was perceived as inadequate and not tailored to the needs of the individual”. This statement needs need some elaboration.
AMENDMENT: rewritten (Line 554-558)

8/ Line 536 “The delivery of individual prevention packages has been met with
relative scepticism”. By whom and why? The authors should refer to current recommendations relating to very brief and brief interventions given by the dental team for promoting positive oral health behaviours (Delivering Better Oral Health 3rd edition, Department of Health 2014).

AMENDMENT: Re-written with citations for delivering and commissioning guidance and systematic reviews relating to oral health promotion (Line 628-631).

- Minor Essential Revisions

9/ The topic guide should be presented as a list or table.

AMENDMENT: Interview schedule included (Line 171-185)

Additional material submitted by the reviewers

Comment Line 179

AMENDMENT: mean caries amended to mean D3MFT caries

Comment Line 179

AMENDMENT: paragraph moved (Line 216-224)

Comment Table 2

AMENDMENT: Row 1 merged. Row 4 changed subject heading to Subjects (n=41) and merged row. Row 9: changed subject heading to Recruited (n=19) and merged row.

Editorial comments:

Table 3 contains too many personal identifiers; please modify the table so that individual patients could not be identified with the information given.

AMENDMENT: Deleted the column identifying participant ethnicity. This is reported in general terms in Table 1. Amended the “Socio-economic status” column to categories of deprivation dichotomised as IMDQ 1-3 and IMDQ 3-4.