**TITLE: Ethical issues regarding publication of Letters to the Editor**

Comments on revised submission:

1.The authors are discussing an important issue -- the manner in which journal editors treat letters commenting on articles published with them. They are to be commended for making this effort. However, I see certain problems with this submission.

2.The authors have not explained how they identified these six cases, collected the relevant data, and analysed it. This may be one reason it is difficult to understand how they have organised their conclusions.

3.The writing is not clear and I am unable to understand the specifics of some of these cases, as I had marked in the original submission.

4.Some of these case studies are of the authors' own experiences, and others apparently are not. There is no single source of the information, and some communication can be made available but other correspondence may not be shared.

5.In this situation, I don't think we can go forward with the submission as it is.

I suggest that the authors start again by:

-- describing the way, they went about identifying the cases,

--collecting the relevant data, and

--analysing them. They must describe each case clearly.  They can then comment on the major issues that emerge from these cases.

I suggest that they work with colleague more familiar with formal academic writing. Clarity of writing is a non-negotiable.

6. I do not wish to discourage the authors but we can consider looking at a submission on this issue only if it meets all these conditions.

7. We may ask to see the data on which they have based their article.
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