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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Mr Danrolf de Jesus,

Many thanks for your comments and those of the reviewers. We have sent in our revised manuscript.

We have made changes in the manuscript noting the limitations (particularly the lack of sensitively) of using Qof clinical points as a quality indicator; however, we have kept the analysis the same as this variable provides an overall or more general indicator, and being directly used to calculate payments to practices, reflects the success of practices in relation to the incentive.

We have stated that this is an ecological study, that the results may be biased in that 16% of admissions were missing, explained the distance away from the ED and admission rate (that this finding, although complicated by the interaction between distance and IMD, makes sense in that affluent people stay at home if they are at greater distance from the hospital, but deprived people don't; this is likely to reflect social circumstances, such as transport, support from carers etc., and potentially also the particular geography of Northamptonshire), clarified the associations between deprivation and admission rates and revised the strength of the findings/conclusion.

We have clarified the aims of the study and the roles of the different authors. We have also changed the grammar in some of the sentences and changed the typos highlighted.

We look forward to hearing from you

Stephen Gunther