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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Wilkinson,

please find attached the second revision of the manuscript

“Losing the genetic twin: donor grief after unsuccessful unrelated stem cell transplantation”

by Martina Wanner, Sandra Bochert, Iris M Schreyer, Gabi Rall, Claudia Rutt, and Alexander H Schmidt (MS: 1085 6887 9320 7860).

Due to an additional reviewer comment, we further shortened the Result section of the manuscript. Changes to the first revision are discussed in detail in the following.

Yours sincerely,

Martina Wanner

Manuscript: “Losing the genetic twin: donor grief after unsuccessful unrelated stem cell transplantation“

MS: 1085 6887 9320 7860

Comment of Reviewer R M Jindal

1. The result section is still excessive as these have already been summarized in the tables.
We made the following changes to address the comment:

a) We deleted

“This results are also confirmed by logistic regression analysis (see paragraph Association of donor responses with background characteristics and type of contact).”

b) We deleted

“There are no significant differences between Groups A/B and C with respect to the items “helpful” (#2 test, p=0.38) and “informative” (#2 test, p=0.49).”

c) We replaced

“Donors who received the information of their recipient’s death by phone more often consider the communication as sensitive (Item #3) and the information as sufficient (Item #5). These findings are also significant (sensitive communication, p=0.003) or close to significant (sufficient information, p=0.02) in the respective univariate tests (see paragraph Quantitative analysis of donor responses).”

by

“Items #3 and #5 are also significant (sensitive communication, p=0.003) or close to significant (sufficient information, p=0.02) in the respective univariate tests (see paragraph Quantitative analysis of donor responses).”

d) We replaced

“Gender seems to play an important role in evaluations given by donors. Compared to male donors, women more often regard the communication as sensitive, more often feel helplessness and more often think about the recipient or the family of the recipient (Items #4, #7, #8, and #12). These findings may refer to some gender-specific appraisals.”

by

“Items #4, #7, #8, and #12 may refer to some gender-specific appraisals.”

e) We replaced

“It also seems plausible that donors who already had anonymous contact with the recipient think about him and his family more often than other donors (Item #13). These donors might already have established a closer relationship with their recipients.”
by

“The correlation suggested by Item #13 also seems plausible as the respective donors might already have established a closer relationship with their recipients.”

In total, these changes reduce the word count of the Results section by 130 words. Redundancies between tables and the main manuscript text should be widely eliminated through changes c) - e).