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Reviewer's report:

Review of 'How Much Dentists are Ethically Concerned about Overtreatment; a Vignette-Based Survey in Switzerland'

In general, this paper is an important contribution in a field where there is little research and/or discussion. There are strengths and shortcomings which are listed below.

I shall first address the questions 1-10, then present detailed comments:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? PARTLY
3. Are the data sound? MOSTLY
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? YES
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? YES
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? PARTLY
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? YES
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? YES
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? MOSTLY
10. Is the writing acceptable? MOSTLY

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. Abstract: A reader should be able to read this independently of the main paper. Therefore, options c and e should be shortly described.

2. Abstract: Reference to female dentists and specialists should be deleted here, because in the main text the results are not properly presented and discussed, but only mentioned in passing.

3. P.9-10: the vignette should be described in a way that is more reader-friendly to a non-dentist.
4. P.10. lines 251-254: It is not methodologically meaningful to add the results together as the author have done. Thus, the conclusion on lines 253-255 cannot be drawn.

5. P.16, lines 340-342: see my point 4 above.

6. P.16: The conclusions should be based on the results only. In the current version there are several opinions which be correct but which are not based on the results of this study.

To sum up, the authors should perhaps emphasize more the main finding of the study (lines 213-216), and speculate less (like lines 251-255)

Minor Essential Revisions:
7. Line 135: 29.86 -> 29.9
8. Line 188: explain CBCT
9. Table 2: 19.8536 -> 19.6 etc.
10. Lines 205-208: delete or expand

**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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