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Dear Dr. Norton:

On behalf of my author colleagues at AXDEV, I am pleased to submit the revised manuscript entitled: “Issues and challenges in the assessment, diagnosis and treatment of cardiovascular risk factors: assessing the needs of cardiologists”

Authors: Sean M. Hayes, Martin Dupuis, Suzanne Murray

Please see below our point-by-point response to the concerns of the reviewers:

Reviewer: Daniel D. Duffy

_The authors must revise the manuscript to reference the graphic materials. These do not have legends and titles and are difficult to place in the manuscript._

We have clearly identified where to place each figure and table within the text of the manuscript. We have added legends to each figure to clarify their meaning and value.

_The conclusion that the cardiologists lacked communication skills is not well substantiated._

We have provided supportive literature regarding physicians’ skills in communicating risks to patients.

Reviewer: Donna E. Stewart

_The findings that academic and community specialists have different opinions or learning styles is present across specialties and is not new._

Findings about difference between academic and community specialists were removed from the manuscript since they did not bring anything significant to the current article. In addition, it was not an objective of this study to explore differences between academic and community specialists.

_Specialists across specialties complain about GP referrals as do GP’s complain about specialists’ report._

References were incorporated to substantiate this finding.

_Residual risk may not be poorly understood by cardiologists but it is difficult to discuss with patients_
We kept this finding as is. Our findings indicated the cardiologists’ lack of familiarity and understanding of the concept of residual risk.

*The graphs are largely uninformative and should be reduced.*

We removed several figures and only kept the ones that were the more informative and supportive of the key conclusions.

We are looking forward to your comments and working with the editors of *BMC Medical Education* in the publication of the manuscript.

Yours truly

Sean M. Hayes