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Dear Natalie Pafitis,

We are delighted to hear that you are prepared to publish our paper “Priority Setting in Primary Health Care – Dilemmas and Opportunities: A Focus Group Study” (MS: 1245552833375119). We hereby submit a new version of our paper. We have considered the remarks and revised the manuscript in accordance with the suggestions from the reviewers. Comments on the remarks of the referees are enclosed.

Yours sincerely,

Eva Arvidsson
Response to the comments from editor
Go through the manuscript formatting checklist one more time and ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to all of the points.
Ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style

Formatting has been checked and revised.

Response to the comments from reviewer 1
Version: 2 Date: 18 June 2010
Reviewer: Anne Slowther

I note that there are still instances of interview and focus group being used interchangeable notaluable in the analysis section of the Method. This should be addressed.

This has been addressed, and the sentences that included interview have been revised (highlighted in yellow):

Page 6, 2nd paragraph:
Initially the transcripts from the focus groups were read several times by EA and MA to obtain an overview of the material. Subsequently meaning units in the text were identified and manually sorted into groups according to the topics from the main questions in the focus groups, i.e. the three key priority-setting criteria.

Page 8, 2nd paragraph:
Throughout the focus group discussions two aspects facing the GPs and nurses were apparent: 1) the need to treat the illness and 2) the need to understand the individual patient.

Page 14 last paragraph:
Statements supporting all of the categories were given in nearly all focus groups, but it is possible that additional sessions with the remaining staff, certainly the nurses, would have generated further information.

Page 15, 2nd paragraph:
The GPs and nurses worked together, and had they participated in the same focus group the differences in their perceptions might have diminished [16].

Page 15, last paragraph:
The GPs and nurses were relatively comfortable with using two of the criteria for priority setting: severity and patient benefit, both of which are familiar concepts in daily PHC work.

Page 19, 3rd paragraph:
EA and MA planned the study, conducted the focus group sessions and analysis, and were involved in drafting the manuscript.
Response to the comments from reviewer 2
Version: 2 Date: 29 June 2010
Reviewer: Sabrina Wong

There are still some editorial mistakes that need fixing.

Formatting has been checked and revised.

Needs some language corrections before being published

The manuscript has been re-edited, this time by a professional, native-English-speaking reviewer. The reviewer is an experienced medical writer/editor/translator, a former consulting editor for the International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care, and has, for the past three decades, prepared English manuscripts/material for premier organisations in Sweden, e.g. the Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care (SBU), the Swedish Research Council (VR), and the Karolinska University Hospital. (Revisions in red.)