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Dear Dr. Clare Collett

We are submitting the revised version of the manuscript for consideration of publication in your esteemed journal BMC Family Practice.

The responses to the reviewers’ comments are given below.

R Bojalil Reviewer: We are thankful to the reviewer for recommending the acceptance of our manuscript.

J Cleland Reviewer
Comment 1: Further details of the sampling procedure are given in page 5, paragraph 2, lines 3 and 4 in the methods section. The respondents were randomly selected from a list of individuals residing in Pokhara city and the three villages.
Comment 2: Reasons for the low response rate are given in page 5, paragraph 2, lines 5 to 9 in the methods section. Suspicion on the part of the interviewees, a feeling that they may get into trouble were some of the reasons. Young females were reluctant to be interviewed by the male volunteers who administered the questionnaire.
Comment 3: The issue has been partly resolved in page 10, paragraph 2, lines 3 to 6. We agree that in urban areas with greater accessibility to medical care the incidence of self-medication is expected to be lower contrary to the findings of our study. The low sample size and the low response rate of females, maybe confounding factors.

Andrew Herxheimer Reviewer
Comment 1: We are thankful to the reviewers for their valuable comments which helped us to revise the manuscript.
Comment 2: We had already sent the English translation of the questionnaire and the proforma used to record the information as additional files with the main manuscript. We have referred to the questionnaire and the proforma with the additional file numbers in page 5, paragraph 3 in the methods section. An additional files section has been included at the end of the manuscript.
Comment 3: The manuscript has been copyedited by the Manuscript presentation service of the
University of Aberdeen.
Comment 4: All percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number as suggested by the reviewer.
Comment 5: The mode of our study has been mentioned in page 10, paragraph 5 in the Discussion section.
We have as already mentioned, added an additional files section at the end of the manuscript. We have also checked the manuscript for typing errors and small changes to the text.
We hope that the manuscript will be formally accepted
Thanking you
Your's sincerely

Dr.P.Ravi Shankar