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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editor, Dr Hayley Henderson. Thank you for your fast response to our ms titled “De-tabooing control of dying. A grounded theory.” We are grateful for your critique and here follows our point by point responses:

1. Methods: “At present, your methodology is slightly unclear. Can you please ensure that your Methods section are written and presented in a clear, concise manner? Could you please provide more detail with regards to the development of the interviews and internet forums – how were they developed? Can you please also state which recognized qualitative methodology you used for analyzing or synthesizing the data”

RE: We have now rewritten and expanded the Methods section (945 vs 769 words) dividing it into Data collection and Data analysis to make it more clear and concise. As we emphasize in the Methods section we are using classic grounded theory (CGT), ie grounded theory taught by Barney G Glaser, to analyze our data. Although CGT is the most cited method when it comes to qualitative data analysis it is rarely used. We now comment on this in the Discussion section.

2. Related Publications: “After assessing your References we can see that a related study has been published in Scandinavian Journal of Public Health (http://sjp.sagepub.com/content/37/3/260.abstract). Therefore, can you clearly state in your Methods whether you are using data from an earlier study or whether the data has been collected specifically for this one?”

RE: We have included the mentioned reference in the last sentence of the Methods section. We have also referred to another study where we analyzed the commentary survey data in the last sentence of the Introduction and have now also mentioned this study in the Methods section.

3. Results: “Can you please provide a separate Results section so that your findings can be understood more clearly.”

RE: We have now provided a separate Results as well as a Discussion section.

4. Ethical Approval and Consent: “Can you please include a statement in the Methods section whether you obtained ethical approval for your study? Please list the full name of the ethical committee that granted approval. If you did not obtain ethical approval, we will require you to forward documentary evidence to us from an ethical committee, detailing that your study was exempt from the requirement of ethical approval. Can you please also include a statement, which outlines that patient consent was obtained prior to the commencement of the study?”

RE: We have now rewritten the last part in the Methods section dealing with Ethical approval. According to Swedish law, survey and interview data from people that are not patients do not require formal ethical approval since it does apply to the law concerning research on human subjects http://www.notisum.se/rnp/sls/lag/20030460.htm. We did however, apply for formal ethical approval by the Regional Research Ethics Committee in Stockholm and were given an advisory statement with the Diary registration number 2007/310-31. This advisory statement also applies to the studies with reference nrs 10 and 21 in the ms.