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Dear BMC Editorial Production Team,

The following changes were requested. Our response is indicated by the usage of bold font:

- Structure: Please provide a "Conclusions" section separate from the Discussion. **Done**
- Tables: please note that we are unable to display text vertically within the cells: please re-layout your table without these vertical elements. **Done**
- References: the reference list should contain up to 30 authors' names for each citation. The term "et al." should not be used if there are fewer than 30 authors. **Done**
- Typography: Please take this opportunity to check your manuscript for any typographical errors and to make any final corrections or revisions. We discovered one more typographical error in the results paragraph of the abstract: 0.002 to 0.054 should read 0.001 to 0.054. This was corrected.

The following changes were not explicitly requested, but are probably required:
- An electronic source was added to reference 8
- An electronic source was added to reference 30

The following changes were not explicitly requested, but would prevent possible misunderstanding for a small part of the audience:
- The intra-class correlation (ICC) varies from 0 to 1, but may be interpreted as the percentage of variance explained (an ICC of 0.05 means that 5% of the variance is explained). To prevent that the reader would interpret an ICC of 0.05 as 0.05% explained variance rather than 5%, we would like to request the following minor additions:
  1. page 4: ..."on a scale from 0 to 1"
  2. page 12: …..”which means that 0.1% to 5.4% of the variance in patient experiences may be attributed to health care providers”.

Both are marked by highlighted text and may be removed should this addition not be granted. This issue occurred because we initially reported the ICC as a percentage (from 0 – 100%), but changed the presentation in response to a reviewers comment without adding an explicit statement on how the ICC relates to the percentage explained variance.

I hope the changes made are satisfactory an please do no hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Many thanks,

All the best,

Dolf de Boer