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To
The Editorial Team,

MS: 1974940804572180 – General practitioners’ conceptions of depression and professional competence. A postal survey.

Thanks for your letter and the reviewer’s report! We have reconsidered our manuscript according to the remarks and made a number of changes.

N.B. Our indications of the changes (pages, lines) refer to the new version of the manuscript.

1. The title has been changed to:

   General practitioners’ conceptions about treatment of depression and factors that may influence their practice in this area. A postal survey.

2. The present study is descriptive. Since we submitted the present manuscript to you, our previous study, General practitioners’ conceptions of depressive disorders in relation to regional sales levels of antidepressive drugs. A study based on a postal survey and ecological data has been published in Scand J Prim Health Care 2005, 23:11 – 17. There is presented cross-tabulations between the GPs’ answers on the different items and the local sales levels of antidepressive drugs. We have now given a short account of that study in the Introduction (page 3, lines 16 – 24) and also referred to it in the Discussion (page 10, lines 9 -10). Our reason for publishing the present purely descriptive study is that we think the findings are valuable to know for those who are trying to change the ways GPs handle depressed patients.

3. To oblige reviewer’s remark on the terms “private experience” and “individual experience” we have changed the sentence to “experiences, both from clinical work and private life” (page 2, line 17). In addition, we reformulated that entire sentence (page 2, lines 16 – 19).

4. Because of the reviewer’s remark we have changed “informants” to “interviewed GPs” (page 3, line 14).
5. Because of the reviewer’s remark that “internal drop off” needs to be clarified, we have added clarifications: “i.e. all responders answered to all items” (page 4, line 22) and , “i.e. some responders did not answer all items” (page 8, line 16).

6. We have changed the disposition of Methods. Now we have placed the Participants sub-section before the Instrument sub-section. We have added the sub-section Performance.

7. The definition of the term “ADs” has been added (page 3, line 13).

* We have also made a number of changes not initiated by the reviewer.

1. On title page we have added a third affiliation of the author Stig J Andersson.

2. Generally “experience” is changed to “experiences” in all the manuscript.

3. In Abstract:

   Methods: changed to: “A postal questionnaire to a stratified sample of 617 Swedish GPs.”

   Results: first line: “think” is changed to “assume”.

   “experience” is generally changed to “experiences”.

   4th line: “had” is changed to “have”.

   7th line: “private experience” is changed to “experiences from private life”.

   Conclusion: the two first sentences are changed to:

   “GPs tend to emphasize experiences, both from clinical work and private life, and overlook influences of collegial dealings and ongoing CME as well as the effects of the pharmaceutical companies’ marketing activities. Many GPs appear to need more evidence based knowledge about depressive disorders”.

4. Introduction, page 4, lines 3 - 5: The passage is changed to:

   “The purpose of the present study was to elaborate further the frequencies of Swedish GPs’ conceptions of depressive disorders and its treatment and of their ideas of factors that may influence their manner of work with depressive patients.”
5. **Methods.** The *Participant* sub-section page 4, line 8: “a” is changed to “the previous”.
   Page 4, line 9: “regional” is changed to “local”.
   Page 4, line 10: “reason” is exchanged to “purpose”.
   Page 4, line 17: “the” is changed to “a”.

6. In the *Instrument* page 4, line 23 – page 5, line 1: changed to “questionnaire was tested in 20 GPs. That pilot study had a response rate of 75 per cent, no internal drop off, i.e. all responders answered to all items, and the answers were spread over the alternatives of the Likert scale on most items.”

7. Page 5, line 3: changed to “In the graphs, the GP’s answers are combined to a three-degree scale after merging”

8. In *Results* page 6, line 1: changed to “To work with depressive patients was perceived a more positive than negative task by 69 per”

9. Page 6, line 9: “think” is changed to “assume”.
   The previous sentence after “treatment” is cancelled.

10. Page 6, lines 20 – 21: changed to “Table I displays factors, which, according to the GPs, may have influenced their manner of working with depressed patients.”

11. In the *Discussion* section page 7, lines 17 and 19: “have” and “agree” are changed to “had” and “agreed”.
   Same page, line 18: “think” is changed to “assumed”.

12. Page 8, line 9: “some” is changed to “minor”.

13. Page 8, line 12: “study” is changed to “studies”.

14. Page 9, lines 1 - 2: the text is changed to: “These findings appear not to have become generally accepted by Swedish GPs, probably partly due to the limited access to psychotherapists.”

15. Page 9, line 22: “the” is changed to “their”.

16. Page 10, line 3: the passage “and has good reasons” is cancelled.
17. Page 10, line 24: “individual experience” is changed to “their own experiences of clinical work and private life”

18. Page 10, lines 14 – 17 are changed to: “In our previous study we learned that high sales levels correlated with more participation in the pharmaceutical companies activities[14]. Also other studies have documented the impact of commercial marketing on prescribing and professional behaviour of physicians[42-45].”

The passage “The results of the present study points to this influence.” is cancelled.

19. Page 10, line 21: the passage “on the other hand” is cancelled.

20. Page 10: the lines 23 - 24 are changed to: “It has been pointed out that GPs and psychiatrists have different preconditions in their clinical work, …”

21. Page 11, lines 6 – 9: first sentence of Conclusions is changed to: “In their conceptions of factors that form their way to treat depressed patients, GPs tend to emphasize experiences, both from clinical work and private life, and overlook influences of collegial dealings and ongoing CME as well as the effects of the pharmaceutical companies’ marketing activities.”

22. Page 11, line 11: comma is cancelled.