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Dear Editor of *BMC Health Services Research*

Please find enclosed a revised manuscript, ‘*Difficulty and appropriateness of decision-making by General Practitioners: a systematic review of scenario studies*’, which we wish to submit for peer review and hopefully publication in *BMC Health Services Research*. This manuscript has been resubmitted after a statement relating to review by an ethics committee was added to the methods section at the request of the editorial team. We have reproduced the request below, and this is followed by our response and the revision made to the manuscript.

We look forward to your response in due course.

Yours faithfully,

*Nicola McCleary*

On behalf of the author group
**Editorial team comments**

1.) Requesting Ethics statement

Research involving human subjects (including human material or human data) that is reported in the manuscript must have been performed with the approval of an appropriate ethics committee and be in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration ([http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html](http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html)). A statement to this effect must appear in the Methods section of the manuscript, including the name of the body which gave approval, with a reference number where appropriate. If a study has been granted an exemption from requiring ethics approval, this should also be detailed in the manuscript (including the name of the ethics committee that granted the exemption).

Ethical review was not mentioned in the original manuscript because the study is a systematic review of published research in the public domain, and therefore review of the study by an ethics committee was not applicable. This has now been explicitly stated in the manuscript, as follows:

“This is a systematic review of published studies. This study did not recruit any participants, but involved secondary analysis of papers that are in the public domain: review by an ethics committee was therefore not applicable to this study.” p. 4-5