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Dear Editor,

We are very grateful for the positive assessment of our manuscript “Changes in public attitudes towards confidential adolescent sexual and reproductive health services in Lithuania after the introduction of new legislation: findings from the cross-sectional surveys conducted in 2005 and 2012”. Our responses to the referees’ comments are below:

Referee 1

*Comment:* How does this data and analysis differ from reference 18?

*Response:* Reference 18 is the article published from the same dataset:


The main point of this article was to reveal the diversity of public expectations for confidentiality – the results demonstrated that both the age of the adolescent, but also the context of the consultation play an important role in attitudes towards the confidentiality protection of sexual and reproductive health care of adolescents. The very mixed support for confidentiality in adolescent SRH care in Lithuania could have an important impact on clinical practice and strategies to overcome the potential violation of adolescents’ rights were discussed.

In the manuscript submitted to your journal the main emphasis lays on the dynamic of public attitudes towards confidentiality in adolescent health care from 2005 to 2012 and its potential relationship to the legislation changes in between these studies.

Referee 2

*Comment:* Though authors mention they have studies cohorts, in fact they are only two cross-sectional studies. So the word cross-sectional may be removed.

*Response:* We agree that there were performed only two cross-sectional studies: one in 2005 and another in 2015. We pointed out this aspect as the limitation of the study in the discussion: “*Another limitation is related to the study design. Both studies were cross-sectional, which does not allow for demonstrating the causality of the changes observed.*”

We would prefer to keep the word “cross-sectional” in the title of the manuscript.
Comment: Many sentences in the result and discussion sections are too long to comprehend and may be modified.

Response: The changes are tracked in the text.