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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and useful paper
A few small changes and clarifications would be helpful

There are a few small typos:
Page 7 line 145 no. should be number
Page 8 line 171 - issues)
Page 9 line 194 a word is missing ? staff, who
Page 11 line 246 relation should relationship
Page 14 line 291 didn't should be did not
Page 15 line 322 When a patient's or When patients'
Pge 16 line 346 This does not read well - Could be: countries, and the use of different proxy responders allowed the comparison of the perspectives...
Page 17 line 352 representative, the absence...
Pge 17 line 357 done could be undertaken

Other comments are:
Abstract - line 60 - explain how this was obtained ie questionnaire to...
Page 5 lines 96 and 97 - would it be helpful to say how the groups had different attitudes
Page 10 210 - on line 209 it states Finland was 27.3% but on line 210 it is 49.7% , this needs to be clarified
Page 14 line 291 The sentence starts with First but there is no second point made - this should be removed

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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