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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

We are very pleased to receive your positive response and conditioned acceptance for publication of our revised manuscript, (MS: 2553047487789526) Scanning for satisfaction or digging for dismay? Comparing findings from a postal survey with those from a focus group-study.

Your new comments were as follows:

"My only concern is on page 11, where "representativeness," albeit at the broadest understanding of the term, is attributed to the focus group participants. Rather than suggesting that the focus group participants are representative to the broader GP population, I would recommend that the authors edit to simply state the focus group participants were similar to the survey participants in terms of key practice and/or other background characteristics."

Response:
We have now changed the text in two places (on page 11) as requested. It now reads as follows:

"Thus both survey and focus group participants share specific background characteristics with the general GP population."

and:

"Although the focus group participants were similar to the survey participants in terms of certain observable background characteristics, we know less about their characteristics in terms of motivation, personalities and general attitudes, and it could be argued that such a self-selected sample is often made up of individuals with a message."

We have also formatted the revised version according to the journal style.

Sincerely,
Benedicte Carlsen and Claire Glenton