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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

We thank the reviewer for his comments.
We provide a point by point response for the reviewer.

The authors.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions

Remark 1
Abstract
1. Methods section: Analysis by multiple logistic regression is not a complete sentence.

Reply
Sentence is adapted.

Remark 2
The OR included in the results section of the abstract are difficult to interpret. For example, in the sentence Drugs use for mental health problems was explained by more chronic conditions (OR 1.43), mental health (OR 0.95) and attitudes on family values (OR 0.59)\textsuperscript{a}, how do you interpret the OR 1.43 for more chronic conditions . Does it mean for each additional chronic condition? And the OR 0.95 for mental health or the OR 0.59 for attitudes on family values? The same comment applies to attitudes on male-female roles below. If the authors add modern to attitudes, it is better understood. The information provided in the abstract should be self-explained or otherwise not included.

Reply
This paper tests relations of determinants - which are continuous - with a dependent which is dichotomous, and where for each determinant the best available self-report measure has been chosen. Hence, all ORs in this context quantify the risk/association expressed per unit of the scale used for the independents. Only the number of chronic conditions is a straightforward quantity (count); hence the OR 1.43 for more chronic conditions implies that for each extra chronic condition, the probability of GP services use rises 43%. In the case of mental health, it means the better the mental health the lower the drugs utilization. In the case of attitudes on male-female roles, it means, the more modern the attitudes are, the lower the drugs utilization.
We adapted the abstract accordingly.

Remark 3
Methods section
In the Analysis subsection of the Methods section (3rd line) the authors should use underutilization instead of (under)utilization.

Reply
We adapted accordingly.
Remark 4
Tables 2 and 3:
The titles contain multiple linear logistic regression. It should be logistic without linear.
In table 2 “Drugs use for chronic” should be completed with “diseases”.
In table 3, column DM, good Dutch language proficiency is marked as significant but the CI upper limit is 1. Strictly it is not statistically significant. In addition, it should be consistent with the variable income in the columna COPD where the upper limit is also 1.
I would move the p values in the titles of tables 2 and 3 to footnotes.

Reply
We adapted as requested by the reviewer.
The exact p-value was 0.996 which was rounded to 1.00 as the upper limit of the CI.
To avoid confusion we changed 1.00 into 0.996.

Results section
Remark 5
The paragraph: The explanatory analysis of drugs use for mental health problems showed an almost identical pattern, apart from the more pronounced specific ethnic effects in persons from Moroccan (OR 0.19), Antillean (OR 0.31) and Surinamese (OR 0.44) descent, has a typo in the OR for Surinamese. In table 2 this OR is 0.54. Since the OR for Surinamese is not statistically significant, the sentence should be corrected.

Reply
We corrected the sentence.