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Dear Mrs. Claire Collins,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise the manuscript: Regional differences in reasons for consultations and general practitioners' spectrum of services in North Germany - results of cross sectional observational study”.

The research compares the content of the professional world of GPs in rural and urban areas in North Germany, their activities and their academic skills.

It is evident that the authors responded to previous comments and to improve the manuscript.

My comments

Methods:
One of the comments in the previous review was related to the questionnaire that is still not supplemented but described. There is still some concern related to the part dealing with reasons for visits. This is a crucial part in the questionnaire and I feel there is still a gap in the provided information: How was the question phrased? Is recall the only way to have the information? Is there information from the medical records?

Results:

The description of the various ways of employment (p. 6, l. 1-11) fits more to the method section.

Conclusions:
This section too long and repeats the results and bring unnecessary evidence

Tables:
In table 4 and 4A needs to add a description of the used models
The order of the tables is confusing the 4A comes before 3.

Kind regards,
Dr Sophia Eilat Tsanani
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