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Cover letter

First of all, thank you for your positive response on our article. We especially want to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments which have made us aware of how to strengthen our article. In the following we give a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ concerns:

- Throughout the text “primary health” is changed to “community health”.
- The title “Ethics reflection groups in primary health care. An evaluation study” is changed to “Ethics reflection groups in community health services. An evaluation study”.
- Throughout the text, “mentally retarded resident” is changed to “resident with learning disability”, and “developmental disabilities” is changed to “learning disability”.
- In the introduction, a new paragraph presents characteristics of community health care in Norway and in the participating municipality (lines 66-75).
- In the aim and context of the study, line 103-104 clarifies the medical doctors’ position in the project.
- Lines 119-124 specify which of the participating workplaces were represented in the interviews.
- Lines 125-134 clarify our reasons for dividing the participants into three distinct groups with one interview guide for each group, with slight differences in the questions for each group.
- In the data analysis, lines 170-173, we clarify our analysis due to the categorization.
- One quotation is removed, previously lines 180-181, because the example did not illustrate a prominent ethical issue.
- The quotations are now presented with references to the group quoted. F – means facilitator, S-means staff, M-means manager. The number used refers to the workplace participating in the project.
- In the results, lines 306-307 and 314-318, we have tried to specify how the staff talked about their learning process as well as what we noticed when we observed the processes in some of the ethics reflection groups.
- With reference to reviewer Gert Helgessons comments, in line 394 we have added the word critical, which clarifies what kind of reflection we are talking about.
- In some lessons learned, lines 453-455, we have clarified what findings emerged through the observations rather than the focus groups.
- In the conclusions, lines 491-492, we have added an important finding, the importance of management support and anchoring ethics sessions in the routine of daily work.
- A new reference is added, nr.23, line 566-567, Krueger RA, Casey MA.

With reference to the explicit examples presented in textbox 2, the reviewer Anne Slowther asked us if we had consent to use these cases. We have not asked the residents for consent, since all are thoroughly anonymized, and slightly rewritten if needed to avoid possible identification.