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Dear Editor

Thank you for the positive response to our previous corrections. We have read the comments from the reviewer and made the following change.

Review comments: ‘It is close to acceptable for publication and I would not have any major objections to such publication even at this point. One small suggested change: Since no quantification of outcomes is conducted nor compared across different study types, it may be preferable to avoid a claim in the Results that “education in addition to audit and feedback interventions does not improve the outcome of the study.” This claim seems overly general and unsupported by the limited data provided, namely, that “both success and failure to improve benzodiazepine prescribing was seen in both . . . groups.”

Author Response: This paragraph (page 12 lines 1-2) now reads ‘Both success and failure to improve benzodiazepine prescribing was seen in both the audit and feedback intervention group [37-39] and the audit and feedback in conjunction with education group [33-35, 40]. It can therefore not be determined if education in addition to audit and feedback interventions improves the outcome of the study.’ This change is highlighted in red in the manuscript.

We look forward to hearing further from the Journal.

Sincerely,

Alesha Smith