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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports on in-depth interviews conducted by various experts on any special ethical concerns associated with molecular epidemiology research. The qualitative exploratory findings are clearly reported and interpreted.

Comments previously made by reviewers have been addressed.

The title is descriptive and appropriate.

The abstract accurately and concisely reports the study and findings, as well as implications of the findings.

The introduction covers appropriate literature. This is an interesting and important topic to explore through subject experts.

The methods section provides enough detail to interpret the quality of the study and findings.

The results section provides themes and illustrative quotations to enable readers to understand the themes. Each quotation illustrates a slightly different point. Each adds to the paper.

In response to reviewers, the discussion section was revised and shortened. I have only one concern. On page 17, line 15 and 16, I didn't see this information in the results section. I admit I might have missed this, but hope the authors can make this a little clearer.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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