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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editorial Team,

Thank you very much revising our manuscript and sending the requests for changes.

Please find below our answers point by point which are marked in the text with red letters.

1. There are some stylistic and grammatical errors which should also be addressed. Please ask a natural English speaker to review the article (they are minor it will not take very long).

_We have asked a native English speaking scientist to do the requested corrections. Hope no grammatical mistakes remained in the text._

2. Please state clearly in the text how many focus groups there were.

_We have organized in total 14 focus groups, each of the seven participating country two (one for professionals and one for patients)._ 

3. "Professionals were recruited at a CME conference organized for PHC professionals" was this the case in every country?

Yes, PHC professionals were recruited at CME conferences in all of the seven countries.

4. "The selection of the patients to be interviewed during preselection was organized in a neutral area from the perspective of PHC setting in order to avoid bias caused by the closeness of getting these services, but in a place with high probability to find patients who have visited PHC provider in the last 12 months." Please give an example or two of such neutral areas.. I didn't understand this.

In order to avoid any hypothetical influence on the opinion of the patients, we tried to avoid recruitment in PHC settings. At the same time, we needed patients who had previous contact with PHC professionals. So the chance to have these kind of people is higher if recruited in pharmacies where prescriptions are bought or in out-patient clinics where patients usually go with referrals from GPs. These examples were mentioned in the article.

5. "and those who met them were randomly chosen" how was the random selection made?

_The details of 40-50 participants satisfying the selection criteria for each group were entered into a database. A database algorithm randomly subselected members of each group who were then contacted and invited to join the focus group discussion._

6. Most of the methods section on analysis is actually results. Please move the actual themes discovered into the results section.

_The interpretation of the codes was moved from the method section into the results. Hope we managed to perform these changes in the way you have requested. Please contact us if further details needed._

Kind regards, Renata Papp