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To the BioMed Central Editorial Team,

On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I would like to thank you and the reviewers for the comments on our manuscript “Prevalence estimates of multimorbidity: a comparative study of two sources,” Version 2 (MS: 1702711119328713), submitted for publication to BMC Health Services Research.

Below, you will find a detailed response addressing each reviewer comment.

Reviewer: Helena Britt

Comment:
Minor essential revisions-
Only one. My previous request no.5.2 was to (re)state the fact that you did not adjust for the cluster in this study in this Methods, and to raise this as a limitation (with unlikely affect) in the discussion. I can only find one reference to adjustment. In the methods last paragraph of page 7, you say we’ve estimated age-specific and sex specific prevalence, without adjustment and subsequently calculated age-standardizes prevalence....” This is not clear - adjustment for what? Please add 'without adjustment... for the cluster sample study design”. I still want this raised in the discussion as a limitation without likely effect on the findings in terms of the differences in results from the two methods - because the differences were so large.

Response:
We now specified in the last paragraph of the Methods section that “We estimated age-specific and sex-specific prevalence, without adjustment for the cluster sample study design.
We also added to the Discussion section the following sentence: “Another limitation is that we estimated age-specific and sex-specific prevalence without adjustment for the cluster sample study design, however, it is unlikely that this has affected the findings in terms of the differences in results from the two methods because of the large differences found”.

Reviewer: Thomas O'Dowd

Comment:
I have had a quick look at this paper and their replies and it is fine. It is a really nice piece of primary care/population epidemiology.
Response:
We want to thank the reviewer for his positive comment on the paper. It is a reward to our efforts.

As requested, we have provided a written response for each point made by the reviewers. We hope that you now find our revised manuscript suitable for publication in your journal and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Martin Fortin MD MSc CMFC