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To
The Editorial Team
BMC Medical Ethics

Re: MS: 6156645679393208 - Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices of Healthcare Ethics and Law among Doctors and Nurses in Barbados

Many thanks for reviewing the above article and providing many valuable comments. We agree to all the criticisms of the reviewers and have accordingly revised the manuscript incorporating most of the suggestions by the reviewers. We wish to respond to some of the comments made by the reviewers and also list the changes made in the manuscript:

Review 1

1. We accept the comment that the ambitions of the paper quoted in the earlier version were beyond its scope and hence have modified the objectives highlighting only the purpose of determining the knowledge and attitudes of the practitioners.
2. We agree that the moral and juridical decision making process would be influenced by the hierarchical position of the respondent. However, the aim of the paper was to determine the differences so as to enable the curriculum development tailored to the specific needs. We wish to humbly state that the survey at least achieved this first step in that process.
3. We also agree that the ‘everyday’ decision-making process would vary in accordance with the position of the respondent. However, as the reviewer has described it, in a survey of this nature, it is quite difficult to ask different types of questions to the different practitioners. Firstly, to group, analyse and compare the responses will be difficult. Secondly, during the analysis of the responses it may be possible to determine the strength of the opinion according to the hierarchical position which we have done currently in the revised version.
4. Again, we are grateful to the reviewer for proposing the view that the survey is important in the first step of assessing the knowledge and attitudes of practitioners unique in every region, in order to contribute to the spectrum of social screen which may eventually assist in formulating bioethical codes applicable to different regions of the globe.

Review 2

1. The “introduction” section has been modified in the present version including many published reports in the area.
2. Although the questionnaire was distributed to a wide variety of staff in the hospital, the present paper analyses the responses of physicians and nurses to see the difference in their responses. We have elaborated on this point in the ‘introduction’ as well as the ‘methods’ sections.
3. We have added more information regarding the development of the questionnaire in the methods section. The earlier table which contained only the percentages is deleted now and replaced by a table which contains information regarding the statistical analysis to determine the differences in the strength of the opinions between the doctors and nurses.

4. The ‘results’ section also has been modified including the definition of the categories of respondents (junior physicians) as well as offering more description of the results obtained. The table depicting the frequency of ethical and legal problems by the physicians and nurses has been converted to a figure to give a better presentation of the findings.

5. The ‘discussion’ section also has been considerably modified with more comparisons and descriptions of the findings of the survey.

6. ‘Conclusions’ section has been modified to make it much more specific relating to the findings of the study.

7. The roles of the Ethics Committee as enlisted in the questionnaire have been included in the ‘methods’ section.

8. We grateful to the reviewer’s opinion, that this survey is important in its field.

9. We sincerely hope that the above responses and the present modifications will satisfy the reviewers.

More references have been added and the article has been formatted according to the requirements of the instructions for authors.

We request that the present revised version may kindly be reviewed again and considered for publication.

Thanking You,

Sincerely,

Seetharaman Hariharan