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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 to the editor’s comments: 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, 28 October 2014
Please, find below our answers to the editor’s comments:

1. Please clarify whether the IRCCS Fatebenefratelli ethics committee approved your study, if they did, please reword your ethics statement:

   The study received favourable opinion by the IRCCS Fatebenefratelli ethics committee to
   "The IRCCS Farebenefratelli ethics committee approved the study."

   As we have already confirmed in the first revision of the manuscript answering to a reviewer’s request, the IRCCS Fatebenefratelli ethics committee approved our study. We modified the statement in the manuscript, as it is now requested (p. 6, line 5).

2. Please can you provide a copy of the second questionnaire (line 14) as an additional file. Please also clarify how this questionnaire was validated and whether it was pre tested in the methods section of your manuscript.

   In the first revision of the manuscript, answering to a reviewer’s request to provide access to the questionnaires, in the section “Additional materials” we specified that “The questionnaires used in the survey are in Italian. A copy of the questionnaires is available on request contacting the corresponding author” (p. 21, lines 2-3). Even though we consider that this is a good choice, we are now attaching the second questionnaire and we leave the editor the final decision. In case, the section “Additional materials” should be modified as follow: “The questionnaire on the attitudes towards genetic research is provided as an additional file”.

   As we have already written in the Method section, “The questionnaire was used for the first time in this study” (p. 6, line 17-18). This and the other questionnaires “were first administered to a group of ten persons to test their comprehensibility and to remove ambiguities” (p.7, lines 12-13). In the Limitations section we have already acknowledged that “The questionnaire on the attitudes towards genetic research was developed and used for the first time in this study, thus it was not validated in a previous and independent sample” (p.19, lines 12-13).

   Now, we have better clarified that the second questionnaire was validated only as regard “face validity” and no psychometric procedures was applied before (e.g. criterion validity, test-rest reliability) (p. 7 lines 13-15). Thus, the present study is the first in which its usefulness in terms of descriptive and discriminant ability (to distinguish between people in favour or not to bio-bank participation) was shown.