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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editorial Team,

Thank you for reviewing and accepting our manuscript, “MS: 1607386739368951 - Availability and Quality of Paraffin Blocks Identified by the Shared Pathology Informatics Network (SPIN): A Multi-institutional Study”. We have made the final editorial changes requested.

If you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me. I thank you once again for your time and for publishing our work.

Sincerely,
-Ashok

Ashokkumar A. Patel
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Page 6 para 2 line - reword sentence Eg Consensus about the final list was reached by the Spin Investigators.
   - done

2. Conclusion, line 8 add ‘an’ “adequate number of cases..”
   - done

3. Second last sentence of conclusion needs re-wording
   - rephrased as: “This assessment shows that individual institutions can utilize electronic data to search for archival tissues which are of interest to researchers.”

Editorial Team changes requested

Abstract - Please shorten the abstract to a maximum of 350 words. Please remember to also update the Abstract details on the submission page.
   - done

Introduction - Please rename this section ‘Background’.
   - done

Methods - Please document under the Methods section the details of the institutional review board that granted ethical approval for the study.
   - This was originally in the acknowledgement section, per the editorial team’s request, we have moved it to the last sentence of the first paragraph of the methods section.

Tables - We are unable to display shading and colours within the tables. Can we therefore ask you to use another method of highlighting the shaded text e.g. by making it bold.
   - done. We have removed all color for our tables.