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Thank you for submitting this interesting and important case study. I am sorry to say that in my opinion it is not publishable in its present form but because of its significance I would encourage you to conduct the revisions and resubmit. I would suggest the following be addressed:

1. The English is not adequate for an English language publication and I would suggest seeking assistance with the translation and proof-reading.

2. The piece needs a more extensive background/ introductory section which should include a clear account of the change of law to the Claeys-Leonetti Law - as for example the case study reported by de Noneville et al Case Rep Oncol. 2016 Sep-Dec; 9(3): 650-654 which you cite. You really need to explain the significance of these changes and perhaps in particular how the law distinguishes between deep continuous sedation and sedation that is otherwise permitted and how both differ from euthanasia. You might also refer to other literature in palliative care such as the EAPC position paper on sedation.

3. The case study needs some additional detail as well as some editing of the technical medical terminology (consider the international non-specialist readership) - in particular you ought to give some account of how the patients status was evaluated and in particular how their request was judged. You seem to suggest that there was some doubt about the terminal nature of the presenting condition but the patient died within 10 days. What palliative care did the patient receive if not deep continuous sedation was it opiates and milder sedation? Was the death judged to be peaceful for example?
4. Your title raises the question of medical staff opposition but you don't actually discuss the grounds of that opposition which is particularly important in this case. You could be much more specific about your criticisms of the current law (this would be easier if you described it in more details as suggested above).

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
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