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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor

BMC Health Services Research

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript and we would like to thank the reviewers for their precious time and invaluable comments. We have carefully addressed all the comments.

At first, I just want you to consider that this manuscript have had a major revision before this revision and it had been reviewed by 3 expert reviewers. Their comments were line by line and paragraph by paragraph, precisely. At the same time before we received their comments we ourselves had done our analysis again to improve the results (codes, sub themes, and themes). When we resubmit the manuscript for the second time we have made all that mentioned points.

Now, the manuscript has been reviewed by 3 other reviewers and overall their comments were different and in some case oppose the previous comments. I think something is wrong here in this review process with 6 different reviewers as we had been really confused and actually we guess we were unable to do the other major revision. Fortunately, the whole manuscript were again revised according to the new comments and this changes were basically in some part like the introduction or discussion part. We also have done our best to report our findings as well as possible and the manuscript has been reviewed by a native edit expert. Beside all these correction we just want to mention some response to the new comments;
As one of the reviewers commented to have a major revise because we haven’t seen one of the well-known and well cited papers like Lewis (2007); it isn’t a good interpretation for major revision decision because we have had for example this author’s papers in our review (Lewis 2006 and 2007). Regarding the paragraph which described the situation in Iran it was the previous reviewer’s comments to add details about informal payments in Iranian health system context.

One of the comments were about extend, scope or scale of informal payments. In this study our aim wasn’t to show the scale and scope of IPs all around the world or it is not a meta-analysis study to bring out features and challenges. This is a completely qualitative study, so in this content analysis we wanted to make a frame based on the literature review in order to show and categorize informal patient payments’ leading factors, generally. The method were reviewed and a table with its explanation has been added to ‘Methods of screening and selection criteria’ part described the quality assessment process of the studies included.

Now, we upload the new version of the manuscript file with its new title to show its difference better than before “New insight into the informal patients’ payments on the evidence of literature”. Again we appreciate your time and consideration. Please don’t hesitate to contact us if there would be any mistakes regarding the manuscripts

Best Regards

Arefeh Pourtaleb

Department of Health Services Management, School of Health Management and Information Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.
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