

Reviewer's report

Title: Experts Attitudes towards Medical Futility: An Empirical Survey from Japan

Version: 1 **Date:** 23 May 2006

Reviewer: Tore Nilstun

Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. There are a lot of numbers, and I think that the article would be easier to read if there were no decimals. These decimals also give the wrong impression of precision.
2. In the Abstract you could either drop the number or the per cent.
3. In Material and Method, line three: You should write "The final questionnaire €"
4. In Material and Method, a) and b): Your definitions are somewhat unusual, but if they were used in the questionnaire, they have to be used in the article.
5. Table 1. Should be: "35% \leq 55"
6. In Attitudes towards physiological and evaluative futility, line 14 from the bottom: You write "deference" but I feel that "difference" would be the correct word.
7. In Discussion, line 8 from the bottom: The word "paternalistic" is defined in different ways. You could ever say that the family is behaving paternalistic towards the patient. A short definition is needed.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.