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The Editor, BMC Health Services Research

Dear editor,

Thank you for accepting, in principal, our manuscript MS 9705648494198222 “What causes treatment failure – the patient, primary care, secondary care or inadequate interaction in the health services?”

We have revised the manuscript according to the comments given by the reviewer, as commented upon below. Hereby follows an itemized, point-by-point response to the comments

Reviewer #1 Nadia Abdulhadi

2.1 We agree that the way we have done the analyses of the qualitative part of the study is an unusual and new way, and we have discussed pros and cons of our new method. We do not want to go into details of the content analyses, and to give some quotations seem to us to give little valuable information. Although the reviewer disagrees with our method, we ask for understanding for the way we have done it and we believe that the method strengthens the study.

2.5 The reviewer comments that the limited number of patients (in all 12 subjects) does not hinder subgroup analyses related to demographic characteristics. We think that so small groups will not give valid results and want to ignore the comments from the reviewer (as it is also proposed by the reviewer)

3. Sound data
3.2. We wrote that the interviews were analyzed. The word “analyzed” might have been wrong and has been replaced by “evaluated and interpreted by the doctors through the questionnaire”. As commented upon above, we ask for understanding for not doing traditional qualitative analyses of the results.

Editorial request
We have gone through the manuscript checklist once more and made some small changes.

We believe that the revision appropriately addresses the main concerns of the reviewer and look forward to publication in BMC Health Services Research.

New uploaded documents:
- the manuscript (the text including table 1)

The figures and the questionnaire have not been changed and are therefore not uploaded anew.
Sincerely yours
on behalf of the authors

Per G Farup MD, Ph.D
Corresponding author