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Dear Editorial Team,

Thank you for your reply dated March 3rd, 2009 to our submission of the revised version of the above paper. We, the authors, are delighted to have our manuscript published in your journal.

Many thanks for your further comments on our study. These suggestions have been addressed and we feel that this process has further improved the quality of this paper. We have set out our response to the suggested revisions below in *italics* and revised our manuscript accordingly (red text).

Yours sincerely,

_________________

Ciara O’Riordan

Department of General Practice,

No. 1 Distillery Road,

National University of Ireland, Galway,

Ireland

cioriordan@gmail.com

Tel: 00-353-87-9611155

Fax: 00-353-91-753470
Referee 1:

Point 3. A representative sample reflects the characteristics of the source population; in other words, do the responders look like their peers who did not respond? This has nothing to do with differences or similarities between the different professional groups within the responder groups (as the authors now describe in their rebuttal). Please address this in the discussion.

*There is no data available on the characteristics of the non-responders, apart from their professional grouping. This has now been added to the limitations section of the discussion (page 9).*

Point 5. Participation in Journal clubs and EBP meetings is a reflection of the practice of using research, rather than generating it. However, it may well contribute to creating and fostering a culture of research within a practice. I realise that you do not have these data available, but mentioning this in the discussion would broaden the perspective of why we would like to encourage research in GP. There's no point in generating research if nobody uses it!

*This is an important point and has been addressed in the discussion section of the manuscript (page 11). Further studies into the use of research within primary care, as opposed to research generation alone, would be useful.*

Referee 2:

*No further changes were required*