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Dear Ms. Aime;

Greetings!

Thank you for your patience in editing my research study entitled “Pediatrician’s Perspectives on Discharge Against Medical Advice (DAMA) among Pediatric Patients: A Qualitative Study”

As per the recommendations sent by two reviewers, I would like to submit my revised research paper with the following revisions specified item-per-item:

Reviewer: Saskia Juenger

Minor Revisions:

1. In the Analysis section, I clarified the process of analysis to include both deduction and induction. I also deleted the sentence “Each theme was identified and re-coded if necessary” because the preceding statements have clarified the process.
2. I have revised the issue regarding analysis and included it in the Analysis section
3. I have provided an explanation regarding why pediatricians in this study required a poor prognosis to classify as DAMA
4. The limitations regarding the openness of the respondents was included in the discussion
5. The reference #2 was completed. Much thanks for this as this was a major oversight
6. The recommended re-phrasing of several sentences and phrases in the manuscript have been adopted fully.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. An explanation about the cultural composition of Zamboanga City has been included in the Research Setting portion of the manuscript.
2. For the quotations, I have opted to remove the local dialect and retained the English
translation instead.
3. The recommended revision in the order of sentences in the discussion section, third paragraph has been adopted
4. The term “..continue therapy” was adopted
5. The recommended revisions to avoid redundancy of the word “watching” in the conclusion has been adopted.

Reviewer: Eberechukwu Onukwugha

Major Revisions:
1. The major concern of the reviewer is with regards to the methodology of analysis. Since neither simultaneous coding and comparing of the codes and themes based on review of transcript was done (and instead was done one after the other with one person not using the transcript) nor a software was used to analyze, I have included these issues in the limitations part at the end part of the discussion. In this way, the reader may have a better perspective of the validity of the results.
Attached herewith is the revised study. Thank you very much for your kind patience.

Kind Regards,

251658240
Bernadette C. Macrouhon, MD