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Dear Sir

MS: 1811828476128688
Intermediate care at a community hospital as an alternative to prolonged general hospital care for elderly patients: a randomised controlled trial.

Thank you very much for the acceptance of the manuscript for publication in BMC Public Health.

We agree that the new comments from the reviewer will contribute to a more precise presentation of the results of the study. The new revisions of the manuscript are accounted for according to comments on the following page.

We have gone through the manuscript formatting checklist to ensure that the manuscript conforms to all of the points in the checklist, and the figures are now uploaded as separate figure files.

All authors have read and accepted the changes.

Yours sincerely

Helge Garåsen
Author of Correspondence

Assistant Professor
Department of Public Health and General Practice
Faculty of Medicine
The Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)
7491 Trondheim, Norway

e-mail: helge.garasen@ntnu.no
Fax: +47 73977062
Phone: +47 72548747 Mobile: +47 91112656
Comments and revision on version 2 according to the reviewer’s report by Andreas Stuck.

**Major Compulsory Revisions:** None mentioned.

**Minor Essential Revisions:**

1. Heading in Table 2 is revised.
2. The p-values of goodness of fit are removed from Table 3, as these p-values can be somewhat confusing when comparing with the p-values in Table 2 and Table 4.
3. All Tables and Figures are checked without finding any new inconsistencies.
4. In the Tables and in the main text we have clarified the term “Readmissions for the same disease” to avoid confusions with the definition used in geriatric literature.
5. We have added a new paragraph in the discussion section on the question about the 8 patients that could have been treated as readmissions.