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Reviewer’s report:

Resubmission
Procedure versus process: ethical paradigms and the conduct of qualitative research, Kristian Pollock

Reading both my own and my fellow reviewer’s initial reviews, I feel that the manuscript has significantly improved.

Rome the two sentences in the Conclusion “The need for ethical review and regulation is not at issue. However, this must be appropriate and proportionate to the risks involved”, are key in the reflection on the way forward for non-interventionist / non-biomedical research in academic fields such as, for example, health services research, medical sociology, and health policy.

Minor observation:

Page 8 should “participant(s) that ‘data’ is generated …”, not be plural “participant(s) that ‘data’ are generated …”.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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