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To the editor of BMC Family Practice

9 June 2009

Dear editor,

Enclosed please find our manuscript entitled "Consensus on gut feelings in general practice", which we would ask you to consider for publication in your journal.

We thank you for the comments of the two reviewers and for the opportunity to clarify unclear elements. Their advices were followed and we think that the quality of the manuscript has been improved, finally.

In an appendix beneath this letter we discuss all items mentioned in the reviewer’s reports and give account for the corrections and adaptations.

On behalf of all co-authors,

Yours sincerely,

Erik Stolper
Response to the report by Deborah Askew

1) The reviewer’s question concerned the ethical permission. We added a clarifying sentence in the manuscript in Methods.

2) The reviewer would like more information on the rationale for accepting or rejecting statements. In Methods, we added some sentences clarifying the way we decided to adapt, accept or reject (modifications of) statements.

3) As to point 3, we added some discussion concerning our decision to confine gut feelings to the diagnostic reasoning process in stead of GPs’ feelings of empathy regarding the patient.

4) We thank the reviewer for her comment on some differences of the wording in text box 1 and 3 and we adjusted them.

Response to the report by Jens Søndergaard

The reviewer asked something about the use of the Delphi procedure and would like to have more in depth discussion. We added some discussion to explain why we only included opinion-leaders and experts and what this mean for the validity and the generalizability of the results.