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**Reviewer’s report:**

Minor essential revision

Since many readers of a paper will only read the abstract, it is important that it can stand on its own and that information in the conclusion can be deducted from the results section. The ideas the authors formulate ie "Sometimes patients willing to co-determine their therapy cannot even afford to create an advance directive due to administration hurdles and high costs. The enactment of the new law can be considered only a first important step forward." do not result from the questionnaire. I would like to see a conclusion section building closely on the results.
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