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Author's response to reviews: see over
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I have accepted all changes suggested except where indicated below:

1) Title page re author Scannell: Author: Department? Response: she is a hospitalist/general practitioner, not assigned to a department.

2) This comment was on Page 8, just above the Results heading: Author: Is this correct? Earlier you say that it was exempted by this board. Response: each study was reviewed separately by the Duke IRB. Study 1 was completely anonymous and therefore exempt from IRB oversight. Study 2 was not exempt, but its protocol for recruiting subjects was approved by the board.

To simplify this and reduce confusion, I have simply changed the note re: Study 1 to say that its protocol was approved by the IRB, which is also technically correct just less detailed.

3) Page 13, top re: out-of-state physicians – I have made an alternate suggestion for wording – please check.

4) Reference #24 – I cannot figure out why the article is not cited in Pubmed but here is a link to the full text on the Science journal website:

http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/280/5362/390?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&fulltext=bridging+the+racial+divide+on+the+internet&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&resourcetype=HWCIT

5) I made a slightly different suggestion for the title of Table 2: “Characteristics of women in the preventive education feasibility study.” Please check and also make sure this conforms to your usual journal standards.