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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editors

Please find our revised manuscript protocol

The Improving Care in Chronic Obstructive Lung disease study: CAROL
Improving processes of care and quality of life of COPD patients in primary care:
A cluster randomized trial

We thank the reviewer for the supporting comments
Please see below our point-by-point response

This is a study based on up-to-date criteria for good practice.
Our response: Yes, we based our study on evidence based recommendations
and updated GOLD guideline for COPD management

The aims are to see how implementations of good practices influence quality of
life and physical health of COPD.
Our response: Correct, we expect that by improving knowledge and particularly
governing professional behavior good practice can be implemented and has
impact on patient centered outcomes.

The challenge will be the good collaboration between general practitioners and
pulmonary physicians.
Our response: We agree and one of the intervention topics is:” how to better
 collaborate with specialists” and integration of care.

The control groups might be better in their outcome by contamination of good
practice from the active groups.
Our response: An important consideration we are aware of. Just taking part in a study has often positive influence on outcome measures also in the control group (Hawthorne effect) We try to reduce contamination by making such influences transparent for GPs and practice assistants in the intervention group and instructions for avoidance.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Our response: Again thanks for the supporting and helpful comments
In addition, we performed some modifications marked in the manuscript to describe some aspects in more detail.
We would be pleased if you considered our revised protocol for publication.
Kind regards

Claudia Steurer-Stey, MD Thomas Rosemann, MD