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Dear Editor,

please find a copy of the revised manuscript “BIOBANKING RESEARCH ON ONCOLOGICAL RESIDUAL MATERIAL: A FRAMEWORK BETWEEN THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUAL AND THE INTEREST OF SOCIETY” authored by Luciana Caenazzo et al., to be considered for publication in BMC Medical Ethics. The manuscript has been edited following the comments of the two reviewers.

In this cover letter we give a point-by-point response to the concerns of the reviewers.

Reviewer: Judy Allen

We have read the suggested literature on patient perspectives toward donation and we have cited the articles in the text. We think that it is not necessary to add to our references the suggestions of general perspective on consent to biobank (that we already knew) given by the reviewer, because in the manuscript we have cited articles more recent and more pertinent.

Major compulsory revisions

1. Background. The point is about first how the residual material is obtained in a Pathology dept. and then (last sentence of this section) about the purpose of this paper which is to highlight that “donation of residual biological material, collected for diagnosis, could be beneficial for society in a solidarity perspective, rather than being directly affecting the individual’s health status”.

2. Discussion. Now we have cited in the fifth paragraph the following ethical aspects: donation, solidarity, protection of the respect of donor’s autonomy through the informed consent. All these aspects are the basis of the discussion in the following paragraph.

3. Irreversible anonymization of the sample.

   a. We have added the points given as suggestions excluding the last one “dignity interest related to the control of one’s own body”, considering that samples are collected not directly for research but for diagnosis for first.

   b. We propose a distinction between the two forms at the beginning of the collection (the donor may choose between OPT-IN and OPT-OUT that can be obtained through different processes explained in the text). In case of withdrawal of the consent given in the OPT-IN form we suggest to renovate the request for the OPT-OUT model, in this way we respect the autonomous decision of the donor.

   c. We explained other justifications in the last paragraph of page 10.

   d. We explained what has been requested in the seventh paragraph of “Irreversible anonymization of the sample”.

   e. We explained that in the last sentence of “Irreversible anonymization of the sample”.

As requested, we have submitted for English editing our paper to a mother-tongue.
Reviewer: Wendy Lipworth

We revised the manuscript simplifying the terminology and reducing repetition.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Luciana Caenazzo