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Author's response to reviews:

MS: 1015159341301745
Rate of first recorded diagnosis of autism and other pervasive developmental disorders in United Kingdom general practice, 1988 to 2001

Our responses to copyediting changes and queries:

P. 2, line 3: abbreviation ‘PDDs’ introduced at first opportunity.
P. 2, 1st line of Methods: opening words changed to create sentence.
P. 3, 1st line of second paragraph: superscript 3 replaced by [3] (presumably this is a reference?)
P. 5, line 6: sentence re-worded for clarity (please check that intended meaning has been retained).
P. 7, 1st two lines of Results: sentence slightly reworded.
P. 10, line 2: sentence split. Lines 3-6: word order changed.

All these changes are fine.

Reference 12: volume number missing?
Now inserted. Note it is a word: “Spring” in the original citation so this is what we have used. The issue number is 87 if you want to add that.

Appendix: please ensure that the appendix is referred to in the text in the following format: Appendix [see Additional file 1].
Done

Tables: Please ensure that the tables are formatted in portrait format
I've done this.

Your edited version of table 2 omitted the diagonal joining up of cells. This is the point of the table: the diagonal cells comprise age cohorts. If you cannot include the diagonal lines, would it be possible to alternately shade the diagonals? Without some linkage of diagonals, the table does not really make any sense.

Many thanks
Best wishes
Liam