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The Editors
BMC Family Practice

Dear Editors,
Thank you for your recent review of the research article entitled "A Cross Sectional Survey of Urban Canadian Family Physicians Provision of Minor Office Procedures". There are a number of errors, omissions and unclear sections and the reviewers have thankfully been very helpful in guiding our revisions. We have also had the article copy edited professionally as suggested. We will summarize the recommendations of the reviewers and our response to them point by point. We are resubmitting the article with incorporation of these changes.

Reviewer 1:
1. Abstract: The number of total surveys (in the abstract) mailed to all GP/FPs
This has been amended.
2. Background: Copy editing including inappropriate apostrophies
Thank you. I hope this has been adequately corrected following our own revisions and the suggestions of two colleagues.
We have outlined the rationale and type of modifications to the Dillman method and how and why we have modified it. The modification is that instead of sending two followup letters to non-responders we have only sent one as our response rate was high and a good proportion of those declining had specifically stated they did not have time or were not interested in completing a survey.
4. Results: Two sentence paragraphs
We have extensively modified the way in which this section is written and have removed inappropriate 2 sentence paragraphs.
5. Results: Paragraph unclear and statistics not corresponding to the table.
This section has been rewritten, as it was unclear. We have also added a Table 2 which we hope will make the statistics easier to follow.
6. Confusion regarding figures due to lack of a comparative table.
Table 2 has been added to provide additional clarity.
7. Discussion: Statistics that are discrepant between the text and the table, incomplete statistics in the table and lack of a FHN table.
Thank you. We believe that the addtion of Table 2 will make things much clearer. We also realized that the statistics discussed in the discussion regarding referral to another FP versus a specialist were inadvertently omitted from the results section. They have been added and clarified.

Reviewer 2:
1. Poor copy editing and editing to improve clarity, flow and tighten the document.
Thank You. The article was written jointly by the first and second author and is probably the cause of the lack of smooth flow. All three authors are native English speakers. As the principal author (Sempowski) I have attempted to improve the writing by incorporation of editorial suggestions and through the use of the suggestions of several colleagues. The BMC suggestions for formatting have been reviewed in detail and minor changes have been incorporated.
2. Review of references.
In the last rewrite we did modify some of the references and re-referenced whenever possible with a more
current or more applicable reference. In doing so some of the U.S. and British references were removed in lieu of Canadian references. We believe that the two references that were omitted are not longer required.

This article is now 2,187 words long and the abstract is 342 words in length. There are 2 tables and no figures. This article has not been submitted elsewhere for publication. We have no conflicts of interest to report and no sources of external funding. We look forward to hearing your reply.

Sincerely,

__________________________________________
Ian Sempowski Arne Rungi Rachelle Seguin