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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editors,
We thank the associate editor for taking the time to provide final comments on our manuscript. We made all the possible changes as recommended and we hope this version meets with your approval. Below, please find point-by-point detail in blue. Within the manuscript, you will find the more recent changes also highlighted in blue, while all past comments remain in red.

Cindy A. Kermott and coauthors

Associate Editor's comments:

I'd suggest we accept pending the following minor amendments:

1) Page 6 of manuscript: the authors write: "The ICC can be used to assess agreement among multiple raters and can be interpreted similarly to Kappa (? 0.75 is consistent with good agreement, 0.40-0.75 is consistent with good agreement, and > 0.4 is consistent with poor agreement)." I assume the 2nd use of the word "good" is a mistake—should it be "fair?"

Corrected; yes, it should have read ‘fair’.

2) Page 7: the authors write: "(e.g. identification of a finding on physical examination that lead to a new diagnosis)." "Lead" should be changed to "led."

Completed; typographic error has been corrected.

3) Page 10: the authors write: "We did not evaluate patients' prior experiences with the health care system such as participation in similar preventive programs or the quality of care they received in primary care setting." The sentence should be rewritten as "...care they received in primary care settings elsewhere."

Done; suggested re-wording placed in manuscript.

4) Table 1
-1 decimal point will suffice
-I would present age ranges only, no need for age by decade as well -I don't understand what the column "others" refers to—is this patients without new diagnoses?
-What does severity =3, 4 mean?
In general, the Tables should be able to stand alone and readers should not need to refer back to the paper to interpret them. You can use footnotes to make this table clearer.

All changes made. We apologize for the typographic error on the column headings; this had been an internal code and we removed it from the manuscript.

5) Table 3: same comment: 1 decimal point will suffice.

Requested amendment completed.