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What determines income gap between French male and female GPs - the role of medical practices.
Magali Dumontet, Marc Le Vaillant and Carine Franc

Dear Editor,

We were pleased to read that the changes and the improvements made to the paper were considered satisfactory.

In this corrected version, we have taken into account your questions and comments mainly on the English writing. We made fully proofread the manuscript (we attached the “new” editing certificate).

In addition to correcting typos and English, we have added some clarifications to answer to your questions:

Line 43-47: your sum up was right, but we clarified our explanation to be sure to be more understandable.

Using the same physician dataset, Bashaw and Heywood (2001) explained these results by the differences in working time productivities: women typically worked fewer hours than men, and because of the “law” of diminishing marginal productivity, women had higher hourly earnings than men. Thus, the decrease in working time productivity of physicians is according to the authors in favour of women because they worked fewer hours.

Line 200-204: to precise the results, we integrated the quantitative results in the sentence aimed to summarize the main outcome:

The impact of the differences in medical services provision between male and female GPs (33%) is thus far from fully explaining (less than two thirds, 61%) of the gender income gap (26%).

Table 4: we added a comment to explain that advantage for male and disadvantage for female are finally summed to measure the marginal return for each characteristic (see lines 349-351).

We hope that this revised version of the paper will be found satisfying and we are obviously willing to answer to any additional questions or suggestions. Thank you again for the comments that were again helpful to improve the manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

Carine FRANC, PhD