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Dear editor,

Thank you for accepting our article MS: 1099046454923839
The effect of giving influenza vaccination to general practitioners: a controlled trial [NCT00221676].
We adjusted the tables as mentioned below (cfr answer to the remarks of the reviewers).
The figures were cropped as much as possible.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Michiels
Corresponding author
Centre for General Practice
University of Antwerp – Campus Drie Eiken
Universiteitsplein 1
2610 Antwerp
Tel ++3238202529
Fax ++3238202526
E-mail: barbara.michiels@pandora.be

Reviewer: Mary Patricia Nowalk
I can’t seem to find reference to Figure 2 in the text. Answer: In the first paragraph of the ‘Results- General characteristics’ you can find the reference to Figure 2. Also, with regard to the tables, I believe that the abbreviations and acronyms should be defined in footnotes or else words should be written out in full. Answer: in Table 2 ‘RTI’ became ‘respiratory tract infection’ and ‘HI’ was replaced by ‘hemagglutination-inhibition’; in Table 3 (RTIs) was placed in the title after ‘respiratory tract infections’ and ‘lnT1’ was changed in ‘natural logarithm of titre1’

Reviewer: Herman J Bueving
I am satisfied by the author’s response of 26 april 2006 to my earlier questions, although the discussion section still is long and the ethical arguments not to perform a double blind placebo controlled RCT are not elucidated in the text and in my opinion are weak. Answer: we decided not to change the text regarding these remarks, because the other reviewers didn’t mention these as a problem.

Reviewer: Eelko Hak
No remarks