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Dear Mr Morrey,

Title: Using focused ethnography in paediatric settings to explore professionals' and parents' attitudes towards expertise in managing chronic kidney disease stage 3-5

Thank you for accepting, in principle, our manuscript for publication in BMC Health Services Research and for returning the reviewers' and editorial comments.

We would like to thank both reviewers for their very helpful reviews. We have responded to the comments below in bold, italicised text.

Reviewer: Gavin Daker-White

I detected one typo in the revised manuscript: First line of the first paragraph of "Discussion," p. 31: "Through utilising an focused" should read "a focused". Thank you for pointing this out. We have corrected this on p30.

I also note that the authors use a hyphenated "health-care", although this may be purely a stylistic issue. We have amended this to healthcare throughout the whole manuscript.

Reviewer: David Clarke

Major compulsory revisions:
I note the authors' responses to each of the five suggested areas for revision. I am satisfied that the changes made enhance the clarity of the manuscript in terms of the research methods utilised and the rationale associated with the decisions made by the researchers. I would have preferred greater detail in respect of the description of the clinical and organisational contexts of these units but I appreciate the pressures of word counts and acknowledge differences in perspective in conceptualising context. Thank you for your comment that the changes enhance the clarity of the manuscript. As you acknowledge providing further description on the clinical and organisational context would have increased the length of the manuscript which we were reluctant to do.
Minor essential revisions: Again the authors appear to have addressed these with the exception of reference 41 which seems to be an important source. 
*Thank you for highlighting this, the reference is now complete.*

Discretionary revisions:
I was not convinced that the complexities inherent in defining and discussing the concept of expertise in this context were fully explored, nonetheless I accept the authors decision in term of how they have revised this aspect of the manuscript. 
*Thank you.*

Editorial request:
Ethical approval and patient consent - In your manuscript, you state: "When seeking Research Ethics Committee (REC) and NHS Trust Research and Development Department approvals for this study, we were encouraged that no concerns were expressed by the committees about the proposed study; in fact the REC commended the applicants for their detailed consideration of ethical issues." Please update your manuscript to clearly state whether you obtained ethical approval to conduct this study, and whether the participants provided informed consent. 
*The manuscript has been updated on p13 to clarify that ethical approval was obtained and participants provided consent.*

Yours sincerely,

Ruth Nightingale