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Cover Letter
August 27, 2015
Dr. Clare Partridge
Editor, BMC Medical Ethics

Dear Sir,

We appreciate your review of our paper, entitled, “A comparison of medical litigation filed against obstetrics and gynecology, internal medicine, and surgery departments” by Hamasaki et al. (Manuscript ID 1784760531150337).

We have underlined the changes in the revised manuscript. Additionally, our responses to the reviewers’ comments are provided separate sheets. We thank the reviewers for their insights and you for your interest in our work.

Yours sincerely,

Responses to Reviewer #1

Thanks you. We have revised our manuscript extensively.

1. (P 17, lines 12-15)

#As we gathered material from only two journals, external validity is difficult to establish (being inapplicable in some cases); our data must be interpreted with care. We include this as a limitation of the study.

Responses to Reviewer #2

Thank you. We have revised our manuscript extensively.

1. (P 5, lines 17- P 3, lines 3, P 14, lines 14-15, P 17, lines 3-7)

#We now discuss medical ethics in the Introduction and Discussion.
2. (P 2, lines 16 - P 3, lines 6, P 13, lines 11 - P 14, lines 9-15, P 15, lines 12- P 16, lines 3, P 18, lines 4-7)

#We have rewritten the Discussion and Conclusion.

3.

#We used old cases because database construction is time-consuming. We plan to work sequentially; we will deal with newer cases in a future paper.

4. (P 17, lines 16-18)

#We did not group physicians by subspecialities, as this would have rendered analysis difficult; rather, we defined major classes of expertise. We now mention this as a limitation of the study.

5.

#We used a similar technique in a prior paper; the referees did not see any problem. We suggest that the method is in fact appropriate. In addition, we co-operated with Professor Hagihara, who kindly subjected all of our data to detailed analysis.

6. (P14, lines 9-11, P15, lines 16- P16, lines 3)

#We have done so.

7. (Table 3)

#We have added an explanation to Table 3.

8. (P 2, lines 16 - P 3, lines 6, P 13, lines 11 - P 14, lines 9-15, P 15, lines 12- P 16, lines 3, P 18, lines 4-7 )

#We have rewritten the Discussion and Conclusion.

9. (P14, lines 9-11, P15, lines 16- P16, lines 3)

# We have done so.

10. (P16, lines 14-(P17, lines 7)

# We have done so.