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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Sir/ Madam,

Thank you for reviewing this manuscript and for giving us the opportunity to respond to the queries raised. The reviewers’ points have been reproduced below verbatim along with our response and any consequent changes to the manuscript have been explicitly stated.

Reviewer 1: Bala Subramaniam

Major compulsory revision:

Objective: too nonspecific.
I would atleast state the objectives of this study are a) disparity in clinical uptake of GDFT in US, UK and Australia, b) barriers to adoption of this technique.

We have now included this in the introduction.

State future directions of this exercise.

The point of this exercise was to determine the feasibility of clinical use and to determine equipoise regarding the future conduct of randomised trials. Partly as a result of this work, we were able to conduct a randomised trial of GDFT in colorectal surgery (Srinivasa et al, Br J Surg 2013). The ODM and other instruments are also being trialled within our institution. This has been mentioned in the discussion.

Please state the limitations of finding out the actual barriers with this study plan.

This has been expanded upon in the limitations paragraph (second to last) of the discussion.
Reviewer 2: William McGee

I believe they answered all of the questions and concern and this manuscript can now be accepted in its present form.
Reviewer 3: Christian Von Heymann

Dear Authors,

my concerns and comments have been addressed in a point by point approach. Thank you very much for this. Unfortunately the revisions to the manuscript were not easy to follow as there were not highlighted. As you have stated that the participants of this survey could not be randomly chosen as they were selected by the national societies ("The number of individuals to be surveyed was limited by the respective professional associations. The colleges facilitated selection of individuals with no author input allowed regarding this. ... The only selection criterion was to prevent administration of the survey to individuals who had previously replied other college-led surveys to minimise responder fatigue."), I suggest that this is clearly stated as it is give in the comment to my review.

*We have now included this within the limitations section of the discussion.*

As per previously, I would like to assure you that this work has not been published in whole or in part elsewhere and is not currently submitted to any other journal. I attest to the fact that all authors listed on the title page have read the manuscript, attest to the validity and legitimacy of the data and its interpretation, and agree to its submission. All individuals who have contributed to this work have been listed as authors.

Thank you for considering this manuscript for publication.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Sanket Srinivasan
Department of Surgery
Middlemore Hospital
University of Auckland
Auckland
New Zealand
+64 9 2760044 ext 2100
sanketsri@gmail.com