Reviewer’s report

Title: Attitudes and behaviors of Japanese physicians concerning withholding and withdrawal of life-sustaining treatment for end-of-life patients: Results from an Internet survey

Version: 2 Date: 7 May 2007

Reviewer: Noritoshi Tanida

Reviewer’s report:

General
Now, I think, the manuscript is fine. I have one point, though it is a matter of format as shown below.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
| 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) |
| Table 3 is rather clumsy. Perhaps, the word "reference category" in each parentheses should have been moved to the footnote of the table in such a way that "reference category in parentheses," so that each predictor is presented neatly. |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

| Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore) |
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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