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Dear Editor,

Please, find enclosed the second version of the manuscript entitled “Rationale and methods of the European Study on Cardiovascular Risk Prevention and Management in Daily Practice (EURIKA)”, to be considered for publication as a Study Protocol in BMC Public Health.

Please, see below the addendum for a description of changes made in this second version of the manuscript.

We inform you that all authors have contributed substantially to the manuscript. In particular, all of them have: 1) contributed to conception and design or analysis and interpretation of data, or both; 2) contributed to drafting of the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) provided final approval of the manuscript submitted.

We also inform you that: 1) the paper is not under consideration elsewhere, 2) none of the paper's contents have been previously published, 3) all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and 4) there is no potential conflict of interest regarding the publication of this manuscript.

We thank you for your attention in this matter.
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ADDENDUM

We thank the editor and the reviewer for their useful comments and suggestions. Following there is a point-by-point response to the comments and suggestions.

Editor: However, before acceptance, we ask that you please provide the names of the ethics committees which approved your protocol within the methods section of your manuscript file. We are aware you have already provided us with a list of these as an attachment but we require that these are present within your file.

Authors: Done. Please see page, last paragraph of page 8 and first paragraph of page 9 to find the following sentence:

“In particular the protocol was approved by the following ethics committees: Ethics Committee of Hospital Barmherzige Brüder, Vienna, Austria; Ethics Committee University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium; National Commission on Informatics and Liberties, Paris, France; Ethics Committee of the Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany; Scientific Council of University General Hospital of Ioannina, and the National Organization for Medicines – EOF, Greece; Regional Committee for Ethics in Medicine and Research Sor-Øst B (REK Sor-Øst B, Oslo, Norway; Independent Interdisciplinary Ethics Committee, Moscow, Russia; Clinical Research Ethics Committee of La Paz University Hospital, Madrid, Spain; Ethics Committee of the University hospital of Linköping, Sweden; Ethics Committee for Ambulatory Clinical Research. Medical Association of Geneva, Switzerland; Research Ethics Committee of Medical Faculty, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey; Brent Primary Care Trust applied research unit, National Health Service, London, UK”

Referee 1 did not suggest any change in the manuscript.