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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors, dear reviewers,

You will find our point-by-point response to the reviewers below. We are very thankful for the editor and the reviewers for their valuable comments that enabled us to improve the manuscript.

We have addressed all the requested points and included a detailed rebuttal of any requested revisions that we disagreed with. All changes are indicated in the revised manuscript by using “track changes” or “highlight” and the manuscript conforms to the journal style.

We really hope that the revised version can be published in BMC Family Practice.

Best regards, on behalf of all authors

Henna Riemenschneider
Editor Comments:

In your declarations section you have stated that:

“the study was approved by the Kreisärztekammer Dresden (Dresden District Chamber of Physicians) stating ethical approval not being necessary for this study. Personal data such as name or address were not collected and participation was voluntary. The consent to participate was given by the physicians by filling out the questionnaire”.

Please include the ethics approval reference number in this section.

Reply:

We revised the statement in the text and added in the declarations: Since no patient data was collected and the collection of self-reported data by physicians is in accordance with the professional regulations for physicians in Saxony (Berufsordnung der Sächsischen Landesärztekammer; s. also Declaration from Helsinki), an ethics approval is not applicable.

In your declarations section you have stated that:

“Public data sharing is not possible and only authorized persons (all authors) have access to the data.” Please specify the reason for this and please visit https://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/editorial-policies#availability+of+data+and+materials for advice on the different forms that the data availability statements can take.

Reply:

The datasets generated and analysed during the current study are not publicly available due to the data protection regulations but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

This statement was added in the Declarations.

Conclusions

We have noticed that your manuscript lacks a conclusions section. Please add a conclusions section which should be located between your discussion and your list of abbreviations.

Reply:

The conclusions section was added and also the abstract was revised accordingly.
List of abbreviations

You have stated that a list of abbreviations is not applicable, but a quick screen of your manuscript has already highlighted several abbreviations and acronyms, for example: FPs, ICD-10 F10.2, OR, AHIP. Please carefully check your manuscript and ensure all abbreviations and acronyms are summarised in this section.

Reply:

The abbreviation list was added.

Questionnaire

Please include an English version of your questionnaire as supplementary file. If you cannot share this questionnaire due to copyright issues, please indicate this is the case in your point by point response.

Reply:

Unfortunately including an English version of our questionnaire is not possible, since the study was conducted in German. Nevertheless, it is possible to include the original German version applied in the survey, if requested.

Authors' contributions

Please include a statement to indicate that all authors have read and approve of the final version of your manuscript.

Reply:

Ok, the statement was added.

Reviewer reports:

Bozena Mroczek, Ph.D. (Reviewer 1): Congratulation to authors for the subject selection for analysis. The alcohol abuse problem concern citizens of most countries, not only in Europe, and the social and health price is extensive. The authors indicated the insufficient competencies of family practitioners and psychiatrists in diagnosing and treatment of patients with alcohol problems.

Reply:
Thank you very much!

Abstract:

According to IMRD structure, the abstract should have a part "Decision" (conclusions), unlike it was presented in the abstract as "Discussion.

Reply:

According to journal submission guidelines the structure is rather BMRC (Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions) and our abstract is structured accordingly. Unfortunately it is not clear what is meant by “Decision” part.

Table 1 requires diligent check of numerical and % data, for example: category medical speciality:

Medical speciality 921 (100)
Family practitioner 845 (90.3)
Psychiatrist 91 (9.7)

The sum without missing - 936

Reply:

Thank you for your advice, we have checked all the numbers and corrected this transmission error (921 should have been 936).

The authors didn't separate the section "Conclusion". According to reviewer, the last sentence in the discussion can be used as a conclusion:

In conclusion, the quality and quantity of the education and training of physicians regarding alcohol dependency should be increased to improve physicians' ability to competent and result-oriented care for a large group of patients with alcohol problems in the primary care setting.

Reply:

We thank the reviewer for the suggestion and added the subtitle “Conclusion” in the manuscript.
Slawomir Czachowski (Reviewer 2): The novelty value of the text, which is rather low: the conclusions regarding need for training doctors in dealing with addiction and the fact that training increases doctors' self-confidence are obvious and replicate already existing knowledge.

Nevertheless, the article contains a specific piece of data concerning the amount of training that seems to make a substantial difference, namely, the fact that doctors whose training was ten hours or more felt substantially more confident. This is an aspect of the article that should perhaps be presented and emphasized in the conclusions section as well. The article does not contain a separate section for conclusions, and while that is not unacceptable, at least expanding the existing conclusions paragraph would be advisable.

Reply:

Thank you for this advice; we expanded the conclusion by highlighting this aspect.