

**FM REVIEW 2009-2012 57**

**Comments to Editor:** This is an interesting and reasonably well-written paper that highlights a pervasive difficulty many residents - and not a few physicians! - have in addressing sexual activity with adolescent papers. I recommend acceptance with minor revisions, including the recommendations of the 2nd reviewer (clarify HEADSS, note input, if any, from attendings, address the ambiguous nature of "fooling around", and add a couple of sentences reflecting on why this is such a hard issue to discuss). I also believe the article could be shortened, as noted below.

**Reviewer 1** makes a useful point about multiple authorship on a first-person narrative. I am not sure what each author contributed, but the reviewer's recommendation to shift from authorship to acknowledgment should be taken under advisement.

**COMMENTS AUTHOR:** This is an interesting, honest, and in places humorous article that focuses attention on an important topic - effectively addressing sexuality in adolescents. It is full of rich details that bring the story to life. Please consider the recommendations of the 2nd reviewer, specifically clarify the reference to HEADSS; note actual input, if any, from the attending precepting this case; address the ambiguous nature of the patient's phrase "fooling around", and if in retrospect you feel there might still have been lack of clarity about the topic under discussion; and add a couple of sentences reflecting on why this is such a hard issue to discuss.

Since these essays are limited to 1,000 words, in order to address the above concerns, you will need to trim the existing ms. I think you can tighten the article by considering cutting:

- 1) p. 3, lines 44-49
- 2) p. 5, lines 18-19
- 2) p. 6, line 13 - Is there something I should avoid?

There may be other ways you see to make the ms a bit more succinct, while retaining many of the conversational tidbits and endearing self-disclosures.

**ZAMUDIO REVISION 5/21/11**

**COMMENTS TO EDITOR:** This was a pretty good article, and now I think it is a good article. It is tighter, with some rather extraneous material deleted. Also, the author did an excellent job of revising the ms per reviewer and asst editor concerns. I'm satisfied that all previously confusing issues have been addressed.

**COMMENTS TO AUTHOR:** Excellent revision, and thanks so much for a cover letter that meticulously detailed all ms modifications in response to reviewer concerns. It reads very well now, and tells an important (and humorous) story