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Author’s response to reviews:

Summary of the authors’ responses to the Editor for METH-S-19-00021.

Dear Editors

Thank you for the comments from the Editor which we have addressed in revising our manuscript. How we have done this is explained in relation to the three comments.

1. Comment about continuous ethical evaluation.

We have added a reference to the Canadian TCPS2 statement. This refers to continuing review, which our manuscript had referred to as on-going review. We have added this term to where we refer to this in the last paragraph of the Background section, and to the first paragraph of the section Why on-going ethical monitoring is not sufficient. This section discusses the limitations we see with continuing review, including how Article 6.14 can be satisfied minimally by an annual or end-of-study report.

2. Abbreviations

We have added a list of Abbreviations before the Declarations page.

3. Manuscript

A single, clean version has been uploaded.
Please let us know if you have further comments or questions.

With best wishes

Dóonal

__________________________________________

Dóonal O'Mathúna, PhD
Associate Professor
School of Nursing and Human Sciences
Dublin City University, Glasnevin, Dublin 9