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Reviewer's report:

The authors have restructured and modified the manuscript to address the major concerns of the previous review.

Minor essential revisions
The paper would benefit from careful editing. Due to awkward structure in some sentences throughout the manuscript I had difficulties grasping what was being said and had to re-read several times. The paper would be improved if a good editor reviewed for syntax, clarity and accurate usage. I provide just a few examples from the opening paragraphs but the entire paper should be reviewed with a critical editing eye. Examples:
• 3rd sentence under ‘Background’ starts with ‘This’, what does ‘this’ refer to?
• The 2nd paragraph starts with ‘biobanking’ but this is not defined. Are the authors referring to the large scale collections alluded to in the first paragraph.
• ‘Patients involved in biobanks’ do they mean patients who provide data and samples to biobanks?

Page 4: (2) More information is needed to explain ‘an analysis of specific quantitative surveys’ a) how can a survey itself be quantitative? And 2) to what type of surveys does this refer, surveys of ethical issues associated with biobanking?

Clarification pages 4-5:
It states that ‘In order to compare responses of different groups, the surveys had identical questions and were written using nontechnical language’. If the same survey is being used then do the authors really mean that the ‘survey used in this study aimed to explore the perspectives of patients’ or do they mean that ‘this study aimed to explore the perspectives of patients’. As worded in the manuscript it sounds like a different survey was used for patients but if so, it contradicts the description of the surveys being identical. This description is still confusing and more careful writing/editing is needed.

Page 6 ‘illicit a perspective on the tension between true anonymity and having an ongoing connection to a sample…’ sounds very strange for multiple reasons.

Page 7, the explanation of the answers needs to made more clear regarding Trust so that it is clear that ‘a great deal’ ‘somewhat’ and ‘not at all’ reflect the
survey question options that the respondent could endorse and not the authors’ interpretation of the percentages. I had to go back to the questionnaire to get clarity on this.

I don’t understand the * in figure 1. The legend states it denotes areas of statistical significance, what does ‘areas’ mean?
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