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Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the revised version of the paper *Public’s attitudes on participation in a biobank for research: An Italian survey* to be submitted to *BMC Medical Ethics*.

We have answered all the comments of the referee.

The changes in the text are in bold.

We are available for any further clarifications or information, and we hope that the work will now be suitable for publication.

Best regards.

Corinna Porteri

Brescia, 6 October 2014
Please, find below our answers to the reviewers’ comments:

**Reviewer: Conrad Fernandez**
1. The authors respond: We are sorry to say that we cannot be more precise in reporting the number of the approached family members as, unfortunately, some data are missing. The reported percentage of 80% has been calculated on a subsample of 47 subjects and can therefore be considered sufficiently reliable (Standard Error=6%) for our purpose. If I am in the right place in the manuscript, the text now reads on page 7 line 20-21. “One hundred forty-five subjects took part in the survey. They represented about 80% of all of the family members who were asked to participate.” This is confusing to me - if the reported percentage is 80% based on 47 subjects what does the previous line refer to? The text should be clarified.

*We clarified also in the manuscript that the reported percentage of 80% has been calculated on a subsample of 47 subjects (p.7 lines 21-23).*

**Reviewer: Kyle Brothers**
1. I pointed out in my first review that "availability" is ambiguous and should probably be changed to "willingness". The authors made this change, but missed a few occurrences (see, for example, Page 10, Line 10 and Page 13, Line 3). This term is also still used on Figure 1.

*We made the changes on Figure 1 and at page 10 line 10. It seems there are no other occurrences of the word “availability”.*

2. I proposed a revision to the sentence that is now found on page 11 at line 7. The authors attempted a revision, but the sentence remains ambiguous. What does it mean when you say "from point 2 'Protection of confidentiality' the reported percentage refer to 122 subjects"? Could you perhaps just say "All percentages are expressed as percent of non-missing values"?

*We modified the point as suggested (p. 11 lines 7-8).*

*In addition, we would like to specify that the language has already been edited by the American Journal Experts service.*