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Dear editor and reviewers,

According to the reviewers’ comments, I revised my manuscripts as follows,

ABSTRACTS
1. Result shown in Tables were correct and I changed them (percentages of the response and odds ratio)

METHODS
2. p7. L3.: deleted “etc”
3. p7. L10-13: I added the numbers of the mailing-list members I used for recruitment.
4. p8. L8: Initial sentence was confusing. I intended the answer was either the two particular interventions were perceived as “life-sustaining treatment” or “not”. So I revised.
5. p10.L2: I added the time of the ethics committee’s approval

RESULTS
6. p11. L2-10: According to the reviewer’s comment, I deleted some sentences that are already presented in the Table and added the result of the distributions concerning sex.
7. p11. L2: We defined that “Two couples” of the answers were delivered from same persons, so the total number analyzed was 304. I added the word “couples of” to make sense.
8. Rank of the Table 2 and 3 should be opposite. So I relocated table3 as tables and did table2 as table2. Sentences were also revised so that the each sentence fits each table.

DISCUSSION
10. p20.L22-25: As the reviewer pointed out, I agree that my arguments did not make sense well. I deleted “in a manner consist with Japanese culture and legal norms” and added some words.

TABLES
11. table 1. Initial table did not show data that was not responded. I remake it.
12. table3. I used “reference category”, not “vs”
I appreciate the reviewers’ productive comments very much. Please check my revised abstract.

Best regards,
Seiji Bito, MD, MSHS
National Tokyo Medical Center