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The relationship between self-reported alcohol intake and the morbidities managed by GPs in Australia.

Reviewers 2 and 4 required no further changes.

Reviewer 1

Thank you for suggesting some useful changes to the manuscript. We have incorporated your suggestions and outline them as follows.

1. We have included the definition of heavy drinking used in this study in the abstract, as suggested.
2. We have altered the conclusion of both the abstract and the paper to reflect the results of this study.
   (a) As above, we have changed the conclusion of the abstract
   (b) We have removed the statement in the concluding paragraph of the paper (Page 9)
3. The following sentences have now been clarified:
   (a) Page 5, para 2 “Significance of differences…” now on Page 3 paragraph 2, now reads more clearly to describe the variables used.
   (b) the first paragraph of the discussion, now on Page 5, has been altered to clarify its meaning
   (c) last paragraph, Page 5 now reads “prevalence was higher among young adults…”
   (d) first sentence on Page 6 “Further, after age-sex standardisation…” has also been amended
   (e) Page 6 last paragraph, the sentence now begins “Acute or chronic alcohol problems…”
   (f) Page 8 paragraph 1. The last sentence has been omitted, as it was confusing.
   (g) Page 11 (now Page 9) the word ‘Monthly’ was an error, which has now been removed.
4. The heading of Table 3 states that significant differences only are reported, and we have added a footnote to this effect. ICPC-2 contains 1370 codes and we would have to include them all to make the numbers sum.
5. The suggested edits have been made:
   (a) The word “presentation ” has been omitted
   (b) The reviewer’s suggestion has been included
   (c) The last paragraph of the manuscript has been rewritten to now reflect more clearly the focus of the paper
6. Page 9 (now Page 7) paragraph 2. This paragraph has also been changed to more adequately express the authors’ intentions.