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Reviewer's report:

This paper provides a very interesting insight in the attempts of implementing clinical ethical support systems in Japan. The case examples are very helpful. The method is clearly reported. Interesting to publish, interesting international comparison paper.

I personally miss a more thorough reflection about the basic assumptions of clinical ethics support. From my perspective clinical ethics support can be understood as "moral deliberation" rather than consultancy. But that is a different issue and might be a different paper. I just wanted to stress that the very core of clinical ethics (What is clinical ethics supposed to act like?) seems far from clear. However, the authors manage to portray THEIR way of acting like clinical ethicists. And that is an interesting insight in itself.

Major Compulsory Revisions

I am not a native English speaker myself, but the paper needs English revision. That is the most important point for me.

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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