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Dear Editor;

We hereby resubmit the manuscript, “Ethical challenges in connection with the use of coercion. A focus group study of health care personnel in mental health care” (MS: 1251746508133918). First of all, we would like to express our gratitude for the comments we received from the reviewer and from the editor, and we hope that we have improved our manuscript according to the comments. Our understanding of the report from the reviewer and from the editor was that this manuscript was promising and that it reports research which is of interest to those with closely related research interests.

In this cover letter, we give a point-by-point response to the concerns which were raised by the editor and by the reviewer.

1. Editorial requests: The title page now contains the email addresses of all authors.
2. Editorial requests: Specific regulations which indicate that our study is exempt from regional ethics approval is to be found here: http://www.ub.uio.no/ujur/ulovdata/lov-20080620-044-eng.pdf This is also inserted in the text at p. 8, line 5-7. Note especially §4a: this study does not “generate new knowledge about health and disease” since its’ focus is on health care professionals’ views on ethical challenges.
3. Editorial request: the style of written English is improved since the manuscript was now edited by a native-English speaker (cf. also point 5).
4. Point 2b in reviewer’s report concerning “inter-rater reliability”: we regard this not to be the best way to conceptualize the process concerning reaching a common (and valid) presentation of the data; however, we agree that we could add information concerning the process between the three authors: P. 7, line 4-8: “This means that we have exploited the fact that we are three researchers with both similar and dissimilar theoretical and empirical backgrounds; in total we possess comprehensive knowledge of the health field in general and of the mental health field in particular, clinically and theoretically, as well as regarding research methods.”
5. Point 4 in reviewer’s report: The tenses are harmonised.
6. Point 4 in reviewer’s report concerning overview or table: Our aim with this paper is to present ethical challenges health care workers in mental health face, according to the ways they themselves describe them. In our paper, we provide rich descriptions, and our approach is interpretive. Therefore, we think that we did not “find categories”. Since this is a first try to present ethical challenges in this field, we think it is important to present rich descriptions rather than presentations in tables which might undercommunicate complexity and ambiguity. We do hope and trust that our presentation (the headings included) is transparent enough to make sense to the reader.
7. Point 5, 7 and 8 in reviewer’s report concerning “ethical challenges”: here we have added several bits of text in order to clarify and reflect critically; cf. p. 17, line 23-25; p. 18, line 1-6; p. 20 line 18-23; p. 21, line 1-11; p. 21, line 22-23; p. 22, line 1-2.