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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Many thanks for your e-mail dated January 25th in relation to our paper "Leaving Patients to Their Own Devices? Smart Technology, Safety and Therapeutic Relationships" (METH-D-17-00077R1).

We are delighted that this paper is deemed acceptable for publication in BMC Medical Ethics. Please find below responses to the editorial and reviewer comments on this paper:

Editor Comments:

Thank you for your revised submission. There are just a few technical points which must be addressed before we can continue with this manuscript

1. The abstract uploaded to Editorial Manager does not match that of the manuscript. Please change the abstract in Editorial Manager such that it is the same as the one present in the abstract.

Response: Thank you for noticing this. We can confirm that both abstracts now match.
2. Please include a list of 3-10 keywords after the Abstract

Response: We have included appropriate keywords after the Abstract (bottom of page 1.)

3. Change the heading labelled 'Introduction' to read 'Background'

Response: We have done this (page 2 line 20).

4. Please include a list of abbreviations after the conclusion and before the declarations -

Response: We have done so on page 7, lines 239-245. Although we wonder whether it is necessary to explain what SMS means?

5. Please 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 in the funding declaration. If the funding body played no such role please state that as well.

Response: We have done so on page 8, line 257.

6. Please include any specific grant numbers if applicable to the funding section.

Response: N/A as there was no specific grant number.
BMC Medical Ethics operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Phillipa Malpas (Reviewer 1): Thank you for revising your manuscript in light of the comments suggested. I have read the revised version and am satisfied with the changes made. There are a couple of small typos which need to be addressed:

Page 5, line 161, 'healthy' should be 'health

Response: we mean healthy rather than health, as the latter signals good health or bad health. Given that we are talking about re-assuring patients here, we would prefer to retain the word healthy which makes more sense in this sentence.

Page 5, line 162, and Page 6, line 203, should be worried well

Response: We have corrected these.