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Author's response to reviews: see over
We want to thank the reviewers for their careful review of our manuscripts. We have incorporated much of the general comments into the discussion section. We have made the suggested revisions, as outlined below. We believe that in responding to the reviewers’ comments we now have a much improved manuscript, and we hope that the revised version will be found acceptable for publication.

1) Guiseppe Remuzzi

General Comments
The suggestion to have a positive control is excellent, and we did in fact collect data from 10 nephrology attendings and fellows in the validation phase of the survey instrument. However, given the small number of respondents we did not include them in the analysis. Since the reader nevertheless might find that information useful, we have added it as an appendix.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None.

Minor Essential Revisions
The p value in figure one corresponds to the comparison of all trainees to attendings. We revised the legend to reflect this.

2) Michael Germain

General Comments
1) We agree, however, we did not have access to a large number of PCP, yet. A recent article in the August issue of AJKD does shed some light on this, though.
2) This is a good comment. However, the plan was to administer the identical instrument to both PCP and trainees (to avoid bias), and thus these questions were left as they are.
3) We agree, and that is why we dichotomized the responses.
4) The answers were pooled for figures 3A and 3B, but not for 3C. We clarified the text on page 7.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1) We agree that this is a major limitation of the study which we forgot to point out in the discussion. We added this information.
2) We added references to the RPA practice guidelines. We also added a section discussing efforts to improve implementation of practice guidelines in general. Although the authors (both are nephrologists) find the RPA tools valuable, they are less so to the non-nephrologist who may not be able to access them – unlike the K/DOQI recommendation they are not prominently posted in the public domain (we checked the non-member sections of the RPA website on 10/08/2006). However, if the reviewer would like us to add any specific additional information, please let us know.
3) The sentence was simplified.
4) We have added a section on this to the discussion.
5) We chose to delete the sentence.

Minor Essential Revisions
Thank you for pointing out the typographical errors.