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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr. Hanna Kaduszkiewicz,

Thank you for re-reviewing our paper on achieving a biopsychosocial approach in chronic care. We are glad to hear that reviewer 1 recommends our paper for publication in BMC Family Practice. In this letter we would like to respond on the two comments of the associate editor. The editor’s comments are given in italics. The comments have been addressed by alterations to the manuscript which are underlined in the text. The changed fragments have been quoted in the letter. We also refer to the page numbers so that the fragments can easily be traced in our paper.

Response on the associate editor’s comments on the data collection section

1. "All statements that were more or less related to the research questions were transcribed verbatim." - I think the following would clarify things: "and added to the summaries". Then it would be clear that not only the summaries but also considerable parts of the original material were discussed during analytical sessions.

We agree with this clarification. It has been added in the manuscript (page 7).

   "Summaries were structured according to the interview guide. All statements that were more or less related to the research questions were transcribed verbatim and added to the summaries."

2. I don’t understand the sentence: "In some instances, parts of the summaries were still transcribed verbatim". Were the summaries oral? Audiotaped? I had assumed that summaries were in written form so they could easily be discussed during analytical sessions.

The summaries of the interviews were in written form. The formulation in our manuscript was confusing as ‘parts of the summaries’ referred to ‘parts of the interviews’. In our data collection procedure, we re-listening the audio tapes to check accuracy of the summaries. During this second double check potentially significant statements of respondents were transcribed verbatim. We have changed the data collection section in our manuscript to explain our procedure (page 7):

   "Summaries were structured according to the interview guide. All statements that were more or less related to the research questions were transcribed verbatim and added to the summaries. The researcher who did the analysis (AM) listened to all audio taped interviews again to double check the accuracy of the interview summaries. During this phase any potentially significant statements that were missed in the first transcriptions were also transcribed verbatim. This was cross-checked with the interviewers. The summaries were discussed during analytical sessions."
We hope that our answers to your comments are satisfactory and that the manuscript is acceptable for publication in your journal in its present form.

Yours sincerely,

On behalf of the co-authors,
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