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Authors: Siri Wiig, Marianne Storm, Karina Aase, Martha Therese Gjestsen, Marit Solheim, Stig Harthug, Glenn Robert and Naomi Fulop.

In this cover letter we describe how we have addressed the reviewer comments. First we describe how we have responded to Reviewer 1’s comments before we continue with Reviewer 2’s comments. We refer to the reviewer comments in the numbered order they appeared in the reviews.

Response to reviewer 1. Henning Boje Andersen.

1. In our presentation of the concepts we have clarified how patient experiences relate to these concepts. We have also included the suggested statement that patient experiences are one along with other patient engagement activities.
2. We have incorporated more data to illustrate the motives behind the drive for enhanced patient involvement is improved outcome in the results subsection: Governmental expectations.
3. When using quotes from governmental documents that have been translated by the authors it is stated after the quotations in the following manner: “(translation made by authors)“.
4. The text is removed. All quotes have been checked again.
5. We have added a limitation section in the methods section in which we include limitations of the study.
6. Possessive apostrophe included
7. The phrase “definition power” has been translated as “the power to define”.

Response to reviewer 2. Robert L Wears

1. As suggested, we have changed the title of the paper from “Using patient experiences to improve healthcare quality: a multilevel study of governmental expectations and hospital practices in Norway” to the new title: “Investigating the use of patient involvement and patient experience in quality improvement in Norway: Rhetoric or reality? “.
2. We have added a new paragraph in the conclusion aiming at the macro level.
3. This comment is more descriptive and is reflected upon in the conclusion.
4. We have added a paragraph in the discussion that refers to the inherent trade-offs in balancing quality dimensions.
5. (1 minor essential revision). We have referred more specific to Tritters framework in the “analysis” section.
6. (2 minor essential revision). We have translated the “definition power” concept into “the power to define”.
7. (Discretionary revisions). We have included “perineal” ruptures in the manuscript when we refer to ruptures. This is the word used in the national quality indicator.
8. The reference suggested (Hackman, 2003) is included in the conclusion.
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