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Reviewers report:

This new version has addressed several concerns. However, the evaluation of the multisource informed consent procedure would have been more interesting if it has not been performed so close from the consent, and some questions remains.

- Minor Essential Revisions:

1. If non-respondents were “equally distributed on pathology, department, and other factors”, this should be clearly stated in the manuscript, and “other factors” should be precisely described.

2. “15-20 days” is not an appropriate value for the mean time elapsed between consent and response to the questionnaire. Please provide the exact mean if the delay was measured or clearly specify in the manuscript that the value provided is an approximation.

3. In the abstract and article conclusions, the multisource informed consent procedure is described as a “low-cost model”. I do not agree with this because the need of a dedicated biologist/nurse is certainly not a low-cost procedure.
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