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Author’s response to reviews:

Anne Menard
Editor
BMC Medical Ethics

Subject: Submission of Revised Manuscript METH-D-19-00062R2

Dear Mrs. Menard,

Thank you for your email dated 24 January 2020 enclosing reviewer 3’s additional comments. We have carefully reviewed them and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Regarding the first point, we note that the passages that reviewer 3 “highly recommends” to have deleted were inserted by us at the request of reviewer 1. However, as you passed on the recommendation of reviewer 3 to us without further comment, we take it as the journal’s decision that reviewer 3’s recommendation should outweigh reviewer 1’s request, and thus have removed the passages.

Concerning the second point, we have added two paragraphs to the manuscript to address the reviewer’s request for a more systematic connection of our reasons, and a more substantial conclusion.

We hope the revised version is now suitable for publication and look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Koko Kwisda
Reply to Reviewers

Please find below our detailed response to the reviewers’ comments.

All line numbers refer to the manuscript file with tracked changes.

Response to Reviewer #3:

Reviewer comment C.3.1:

In my opinion, I completely disagree, and find unjustified, the inclusion of the theological - legal - political discussion in this paper. I highly recommend this should simply be deleted before publication.

Author’s response:

All references to this distinction (at line 140 in the text, and in the footnote on page 6) have been deleted.

Reviewer comment C.3.2:

Reasons are presented in the discussion section of the manuscript, but it is unclear to me how authors systematically connect these reasons. No clear authoritative conclusion comes out in the final synthesis.

Author’s response:

We have expanded our conclusion (from line 565 onwards) to explicitly provide:

1) An indication of what we think our framework has to offer in terms of providing a systematic connection between reasons, and

2) A concluding outlook outlining what can be drawn from our account, and what it suggests in terms of fruitful future areas of inquiry.