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Dear Editor,

thank you for the invitation to revise and resubmit our paper titled “PHYSICIANS’ PROPENSITY TO COLLABORATE AND THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS EBM: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY”. As requested, we consulted and included some of the references suggested by Reviewer #2. Detailed point-to-point responses follow. All the requested documents are been accompanied electronically.

Yours sincerely,

Daniele Mascia
Referee #1 (Phil J.M. Heiligers)

In the revised version of the manuscript: ’Physicians’ propensity to collaborate and their attitude towards EBM: a cross-sectional study’ all my suggestions were carefully observed and explained. The manuscript gained in clarity by explicit interpretations of the results and by highlighting main findings in the discussion. My advice is to accept this revised version without further revision

** We thank the referee for these comments.
In the first paragraph of page 10, the authors have modified the manuscript to reflect the age and limited relevance of the two papers referenced in the original manuscript. Perhaps my comments were slightly ambiguous but my suggestion was to extend the referencing to include more relevant and recent articles. To that end, I have compiled a list of them as below and leave it to the authors as to which of them, and where in the manuscript, they might choose to add them.

**Taking into account what suggested, we consulted and added the following additional references:**


Other references suggested were not included because some were already in the paper (i.e. Fattore et al, 2009; Keating et al., 2007), some others referred more properly to primary care settings.

We thank the referee for this additional contribution!
Review #3 (Laurent Boyer)

The authors have answered correctly to my comments. The article is much better.

** We thank the referee for these comments.