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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editor,

We are very delighted that you have conditionally accepted our manuscript for publication in BMC Family Practice.

We have made the requested formatting changes:

List of authors in the manuscript is now the same as the list in the submission system. 'Introduction' has been renamed to 'Background,' and figure 1 has been cropped as much as possible.

With respect to dr. Shipman's comments:

On page 8 (Para 2) we have addressed this issue. Indeed, it appears that the responders are older than the study base. However, this is mainly due to the fact that the distribution of type of consultations in the study is different (approximately 33%-33%-33%) from the study base (Page 5: 39% telephone advice, 51% consultations at the GP cooperative, and only 10% home visits). It is known that people who receive home visits are generally older, compared to those patients receiving telephone advice or attending the GP cooperative. Therefore, we also analysed age distribution per type of consultation and found no relevant difference between study base and responders (Table 2).

The figures in table 1 and 2 are merely to give the reader an impression about how well (or not) the study sample resembles the study base. We think it has no added value to test for statistically significant differences, but that it is more important to check for clinically relevant differences which can be derived from table 1 and 2.

With kind regards,

Caro van Uden, PhD