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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Ms McGavin

Apologies for this omission. I have added the following statement to our methods section, and will upload this to your website.

Yours,
Paul Hilton

'The conduct of this study was in accordance with the ethical principles set out in the Declaration of Helsinki (2008) and the Research Governance Framework for Health and Social Care (second edition, 2005).[43] Application for ethical approval was made through the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS), and a letter of favourable ethical opinion was obtained from Newcastle & North Tyneside 1 Research Ethics Committee on 6th January 2011 – reference no. 10/H0906/76. The study was approved by all local Research and Development offices, and hence the favourable ethical opinion was applicable to all NHS sites taking part in the study.'