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Author’s response to reviews:

Answer to editor and reviewers of FAMP-D-18-00175R1

Preschool children in Danish out-of-hours primary care: a one-year descriptive study of face-to-face consultations

Jørgen Lous, DMSc; Grete Moth, Senior researcher; Linda Huibers, senior researcher; Peter Vedsted, Professor, ph.d.; Morten Bondo Christensen, ph.d.

BMC Family Practice

Editor Comments:

1) Rename Introduction to Background.

Now changed to Background.

2) Rename "Ethics approval and informed consent" to "Ethics approval and consent to participate". In addition, please include information on the consent to participate from GPs and parents.
BMC Family Practice operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Steinar Hunskår (Reviewer 1): The authors have fully complied with my comments and suggestions.

I recommend the paper to be published

OK

Ruediger Leutgeb, M.D. (Reviewer 2): The article now is clearer in its statements and implications for the future. But there are once again some remarks:

3) Your answer to my review comment 17, Page 4:

I now understand your approach in the text but in figure 1 it is difficult for me to comprehend this approach.

We have now made a note to the legend to figure 1:

Note: For one GP on duty per type of shift, the computer system randomly selected contacts (every 10th telephone consultation, every 3rd clinic consultation, and all home visits).
4) Your answer to my review comment 20, Page 5:

In the text once again I understand what you mean. But you have to add this point in the table or in a legend above the table.

We have now made a note to table 2:

Note: Secondary RFE was only recorded if it had another code number or chapter number than the primary RFE.

5) Your answer to my review comment 21, Page 6:

In principle you cannot use Kendall’s tau-b for "Gender" and "Contact type". You would have to use a Spearman correlation (ordinal-nominal). I understood, that your outcomes were nearly the same.

But I have to tell you, statisticians would have been stricter in their assessment.

We have now included a spearman correlation in table 1.

6) Your answer to my review comment 24:

Please address by means of your finding that 156 children got antibiotics without receiving a diagnosis of fever the uncertainty which we- as treating physicians - have to withstand in primary care and OOHC. This is an argument for constant training and has something to do with the experience of GPs or other physicians working in OOHC.

We agree we all have to be careful with our prescription of antibiotics. We made a short sentence in Implication: "The finding that some antibiotics were prescribed without a clear diagnosis points to the challenges that GPs face and the need for continuous awareness to limit unneeded antibiotic prescriptions".

Overall I am satisfied that my concerns with the original manuscript have been addressed and I would accept the article with another minor revision.

Yours Jørgen Lous