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Author's response to reviews:

The Editors
BMC Health Services Research
June 21, 2012
Thank you for giving consideration to publication of our manuscript in BMC HSR. A revised document has been submitted as requested. Below is a summary of the changes made in response to the suggestions and comments from the reviewers and editorial staff.

Comments of Reviewer 1.
I have highlighted the importance of communication in the discussion section.

Comments of the Editor.
I have made a number of edits to sharpen the focus on the research question as requested.
1. Text on the reform in Ontario has been mostly removed. There is a small description of the FHTs in the settings section to describe the type of practice the study was carried out in.
2. I have added a paragraph to the introduction on the measures as well as a table listing the indicators, their definitions and possible data sources.
3. A hypothesis description is included in the new paragraph on the measures.
4. The last sentence was removed as requested
5. The settings and participants section as been restricted to this topic.
6. The new table 1 describes the measures.
7. TCI was inadvertently included in the patient survey, it was actually used in the provider survey. It has been removed.

8. Hopefully table 1 explains this. We did use the administrative data in our comparisons. I have edited this section to try to make this more clear.

9. Section was revised to focus on what we did.

10. Qualifying statements have been removed and replaced with reporting of Kappa ranges and degree of agreement.

11. I agree, see above and comments in the discussion on interpretation of kappa as well as level of agreement. Have also added a line to the abstract on this. Hopefully the new text makes this more clear.

12. The discussion section was shortened and reorganized a bit.

13. See above – I have added some commentary on selection of methods with respect to study intention to the conclusion and abstract.

I

Thank you once again for considering our work for publication in BMC HSR. Please let me know if you feel any additional edits are required.

Sincerely,
Dr. Mike Green
Michael E. Green, MD, MPH, CCFP