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“Telephone referral education, and evidence of retention and transfer after six-months”

Dear Editor,
Thank you again for the comments on the above manuscript. The points you raise have been listed below and modifications identified.

1) general - mix of numerals and words describing months - suggest using words consistently - i.e. six months rather than 6 months and use numerals for data
   p2: "8-months” should be "eight months”
   p8: "6 month groups” should be "6-month groups” - use the hyphen when two terms (as a compound) qualify a third term

The manuscript has been proofread and this preferred style applied throughout.

2) Reviewer 1 raised the issue of clarity in who the 3 groups were in table 1 and this relates to the study flow diagram in figure 2. R2 had similar questions. This has not been sufficiently addressed in the revised version of this MS. Are the 8 students evaluated before the same as the 9 evaluated during? Are the 17 students evaluated at six months the 8+9 or different individuals ?? Describe and amend T1/F2 appropriately - showing whether participants that were recorded were the same or different individuals at each stage.

Thank you, I thought I had made this clear in the methods section but have now made this unambiguous in the text (P6 L23 “but not in the same groups” added, and P7 L4-5 “and were not the same students that made the calls six months earlier” added), Table 1 (“but not the same students as before” added) and Figure 2 (“9 different students” added to 4th box, “Not the same 17 students as six months prior” added to the 5th box)

3) table 2 - while you have met R1’s request for clarity on numbers in the last question the percentages do not add up - Interruptions 6 (6.3%) should be 6 (3.4%) - (6/160 = 3.75)

This was a transcription error on the original manuscript. The data analyses have been rechecked and no other errors are present in the reported data.

4) R1 challenged the reference to other studies without references - you have inserted one reference but still say ‘other studies’ - either provide multiple references for this or change to something along the lines of 'has been shown elsewhere’ - i.e. not plural

The missing reference has been added. This is an (as yet) unpublished report. The wording has been modified as suggested to reflect that multiple sources to confirm this assertion may not be accessible to the reader.

5) some grammar checking still required - Table 3 legend is missing a period. Some but not all bullets in the discussions section are missing periods etc ...

The grammar has been rechecked throughout and missing punctuation added.