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Leiden, June 7th 2006

Dear Editor,

Thank you for considering our paper “Preconception counselling for the general population initiated by general practitioners in the Netherlands: results of response to the offer of PCC” (ISRCTN53942912) for publication in your Journal and the possibility to react on the comment of one of the two reviewers. The title of the paper was changed in ‘Preconception counselling initiated by general practitioners in the Netherlands: reaching couples contemplating pregnancy’. Enclosed you find a detailed reaction on the comment of the reviewer as well as to your own comment and the revised manuscript and one with changes marked.

We hope you find the revised paper suitable for publication in your Journal.

Yours sincerely,

Also in behalf of the other authors,

Joyce Elsinga
Reaction on the comments of the reviewer 1

Reviewer 1 (Leo P. ten Kate)
Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The title was changed to “Preconception counselling initiated by general practitioners in the Netherlands: reaching couples contemplating pregnancy.”
2. The results section of the abstract was confusing and has been adjusted with the clearer part of the results section of the paper.
3. We have clarified the sentence on page 8: “women who had been excluded in the first and second year for temporary social circumstances assuming these might have changed in the mean time”.
   We clarified this in the manuscript: “a questionnaire assessing knowledge of pregnancy-related risk factors and preventive measures, that was sent to women in the intervention group prior to the first invitation for PCC.”
4. Statistics Netherlands has classified the educational system in the Netherlands. The reference to Statistics Netherlands was however confusing in this way and therefore we changed the sentence: “level of education according to the classification of education of Statistics Netherlands”.
5. We adjusted the paragraph format to prevent confusion.
6. The overall study Parents to Be was meant in the discussion and the sentence has been adapted.
   The percentage of 23% was derived from the thesis, which we changed to percentage of the final paper.

Reaction on comment editor
1. The watermark “confidential” has been removed.
2. The Medical Ethics Committee at Leiden University Medical Center approved this study. This has been added to the methods section. GP’s consented to randomisation within their cluster. This has been added to the paper.
3. Competing interest statement, author’s contributions and acknowledgements have been constructed and have been added after the conclusion.