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Author’s response to reviews:

BMC Medical Ethics
Ref: METH-D-19-00011
Manuscript title: Addressing harm in Moral Case Deliberation: the views and experiences of facilitators

Dear editor,

We revised our paper, following your suggestions. Below you will find our responses to the comments. We have uploaded the revised manuscript without track changes.

On behalf of the other two authors, Guy Widdershoven and Hans Alma,

Benita Spronk
VUmc, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Editor Comments:

1. In the section 'Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate', please state whether the informed consent obtained was written or verbal. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure.
Response: Thank you for this question. The informed consent obtained was written. In the section ‘Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate’ we added the sentence ‘The informed consent obtained was written.’

2. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.
Response: We have uploaded the revised manuscript without track changes.