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Author's response to reviews:

Resubmission of a revised article for “BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making”

Dear Sir or Madam,

Dear Editors,

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your positive feedback.

In the revised version the following changes have been made according to your hints and suggestions:

"Thank you for your recent submission of the revised manuscript. Please be informed that we would normally expect an ethics committee to have reviewed the study prior to the interviews taking place. Please clarify in the Methods section if named ethics committee waived the need for full ethical review. Alternatively, if there is local legislation in place that means that ethics approval is not needed for this kind of study, could you please include details and references to this in the Methods section." : Lines 143-150 and Lines 495-505:

According to local legislation (EUH clinical ethics committee, http://www.ethikkomitee.med.uni-erlangen.de) ethics approval was not needed for our study because none of the following elements was performed:

• interviews with patients or children
• experimental tests
• animal experiments
• clinical trials in humans
• work with animal or human tissues.

Lines 18-21: The personal information about the corresponding author was updated.

Yours faithfully

Stefan Wagner
(corresponding author)