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Author's response to reviews:

Response to reviewer comments
MS: 1644758731110436
Informed Consent Practices for Surgical Care at University Teaching Hospitals; a case in a low resource setting

Comment: 1
- I am lacking an abstract in this version.
Response: An abstract has been attached as part of the main manuscript

Comment: 2
- Language review is needed. I find quite a few minor language errors but also some that might affect the understanding of the text. For example, p. 1 intensity of informed consent seems like strange expression and I am not sure what is meant by that. I also find different tense at some places in the text.
Response: Language review has been done

Comment: 3
- The authors claim that respect for autonom is grounded in a patient right as individual, but it needs to be pointed out that this is only one way to ground respect for autonomy. I can for example also be grounded following a consequentialistic argument.
Response: this has been incorporated

Comment: 4
The authors need at method reference to the qualitative analysis and also specification of what kind of documents were gathered and how the informed consent process was reviewed at the different locations. I.e. a more developed methodological description. Other questions that needs to be answered are how many patient records were chosen for review and how they were selected. i.e. inclusion and exclusion criteria. Were they enough to draw conclusions concerning the fact that doctors claimed they obtained i c at the last operation (which is done in the discussion)? How was the questionnaire developed and why this particular selection of alternatives.In limitations the authors needs to comment on the fact that the alternatives in table 2 (which I take to be the alternatives in the questionnaire) are not mutually exclusive which might cause confusion by the responders.

Response:

A methods reference has been added.
A more detailed description of the methods has been added to the methods section

Informed consent was reviewed at the different hospitals by evaluating the filled questionnaires, checking of patients medical files for consent documentation as well as in-depth interviews with a number of surgeons

The mixed approach to data collection was to try to evaluate what doctors know about informed consent, what they practice and we needed to back up their responses in the questionnaires with evidence in form of consent documentation in the patients records.

Comment: 5
- Last sentence before limitations is hanging loose and should be better integrated into the text.

Response: This sentence has been modified.

Comment: 6
Title page: please include a title page at the front of your manuscript file. It should contain, at minimum, the names, institutions, countries and email addresses of all authors, and the full postal address of the submitting author.

Response: A title page with all the required information has been included in the main manuscript

Comment: 7
Lastly, could you provide the institutions name to which the School of Biomedical Sciences Research and Ethics Committee belongs to? Kindly include this information in the Methods section of the manuscript.

Response: The institution is Makerere University and has been added to the ethical section of the manuscript