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Cover letter

Faculty of Health Sciences

Department of Nursing Science

University of Eastern Finland

Dear Megan Haran,

We re-submit hereto our manuscript "Collaborative partnership and the social value of clinical research: a qualitative secondary analysis" (METH-D-16-00198) to your journal, BMC Medical Ethics. We are grateful for the feedback we received. We have revised our manuscript according to all your suggestions, and we have made the following amendments/clarifications as defined in tables 1 (Attachment 1).

We hope that our manuscript is now more suitable to be published in your journal.

We will be happy to provide more information and clarification concerning our manuscript, if needed.
Yours sincerely,

On behalf of all the authors:

Corresponding author

Sanna-Maria Nurmi

Comment

Amendments/clarifications

We have revised our manuscript according to your suggestions and we have made the clarifications using red font color as described below.

1. Submission of a manuscript to a BioMed Central journal implies that materials described in the manuscript, including all relevant raw data, will be freely available to any scientist wishing to use them for non-commercial purposes, without breaching participant confidentiality. Therefore, in the Availability of data section, please state why the raw data will not be made publicly available.

The data will not be made publicly available, because we did not consent participant for data sharing.

This is described in the manuscript as follows:

“Data will not be shared because we did not consent participants for data sharing.”

2. Please ensure all author initials are provided in the Authors' contributions.

The authors initials are now provided more detailed in the Authors' contributions section as follows:

“Study design (S-M.N, A.H, M.K,A-M.P). Data collection (S-M.N, A.H). Data analysis and manuscript writing (S-M.N, A.H, M.K,A-M.P). All authors contributed to the analysis and revision of the manuscript and all authors read and approved the final version.”

3. Please provide a section after References where you provide the figure legends for your figure files. For each figure, the following information should be provided:

These has been added after References section.

Figure 1. Study design.

Figure 2. The analysis process.
- Figure number

- Short title of figure in sentence case (required)

- Detailed legend (optional)

Example:

Figure 3. Liver smear from a 6-week-old embryo (CR length 12 mm). A remarkable cluster of macrophages is seen among primitive erythroblasts (see also Fig. 4). A granuloblast is present at the upper right. H & E, ×1,150. (Scott 1974)

4. Please provide a List of abbreviations after the Conclusions section. If abbreviations are used in the text, they should be defined in the text at first use and included in this list. If there are no abbreviations used in the text, then please state "Not applicable" in this section.

There were no abbreviations used in the text. This is described in the manuscript as follows: "Not applicable."

5. In your Funding section, please also state the role of the funding body in the design of the study, and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, and in writing the manuscript.

The funders role in the design of the study, and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, and in writing the manuscript in now added in the manuscript as follows:

“This study was supported by a grant from The Finnish Work Environment Fund. The funders had no involvement in the study concept and design; collection of data; analysis and interpretation of the data; in the writing of the manuscript; and the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.”

6. In the Ethics approval section, please provide the names of the hospitals from which approval was obtained. If there is a reason why you would prefer not to include these names, please explain.

The reason why we do not include the names of the participating hospitals is now added to the manuscript as follows:

We chose not to publish the names of the participating organisations in order to safeguard the privacy and confidentiality of the participants, as their number in the study was
7. You state that approval was obtained from the university hospitals, but then mention that approval was not required. Please clarify whether the approval obtained was formal approval, or just permission.

Thank you for this notice. We have clarified this in the manuscript as follow:

According to Finnish research legislation, this type of research does not need approval from an official research ethics committee, under the Medical Research Act, 488/1999. Organisation permission for both the primary studies were obtained from the university hospitals. All participants in the original studies received an information sheet describing the purpose and voluntary nature of the study and mentioning the possibility of the secondary use of interview data. Written, informed consent was obtained prior to participation. Anonymity and confidentiality were protected by assigning numerical codes to each participant and removing all personal data that could identify the participants.

8. Please ensure that when you upload your revised submission that it is in the final form for publication. Please remove any tracked changes or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only.

This has been taken into account during the submission.