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Dear editor,

We send you a revised manuscript for the BMC Family Practice with the title: “Qualitative insights into general practitioners views on polypharmacy.”

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewer for the interest shown in our research and the final comments made on our article.

Reviewer one pointed out that in the method section we mentioned three broad topics but that in Table 1 we had only written 2 topics, so we have adjusted this in the Table 1:

Table 1 Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Questions</th>
<th>Specific Questions and Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are your views on polypharmacy in general practice?</td>
<td>What are important factors contributing to polypharmacy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, can something be done in order to reduce polypharmacy?</td>
<td>Are there negative things about polypharmacy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could be a specific role for a GP in relation to polypharmacy and prescribing?</td>
<td>Do you think prescribing practices have changed over time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there specific barriers that you can think of in order to reduce polypharmacy?</td>
<td>Are there specific elements that could help reduce polypharmacy? (types of interventions, education, …)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have edited the grammar and spelling mistakes and revised the article accordingly. We also formatted the article according to the format of BMC Family Practice.

We thank you again for all the useful comments and suggestions made and we are looking forward to publication.

Yours sincerely,

Sibyl Anthierens (corresponding author)