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Reviewer's report:

This was an interesting article that, while focused on the Dutch landscape, would be of interest to ethicists and medical providers in other countries as well, due to the proliferation of various health checks in multiple settings.

The article on the whole was decently written, but I would recommend revisions in both spelling and grammar in some places.

There are a few areas that I think it would be helpful to add a bit more information to make the methods clear to the reader:

1. Of the providers interviewed, the majority (16/20) were Male and the average age (50) was on the higher side. Perhaps some detail on why this was skewed towards older male providers could be useful. Or does this reflect the average characteristics of these providers in the Netherlands?

2. The article lists that "most" of the providers asked to participate agreed to participate. Clarification on how many were asked and how many declined, as well as how they were approached, would be useful. Also, was the decision made to interview only 20 and then the first 20 responders were chosen? Was there a conscious decision on how many interviews were conducted with each of the different types of providers (GPs, etc)?

3. Finally, it was mentioned that all interviews were conducted in Dutch and transcription was conducted verbatim. Some mention of who conducted the translation of all of the quotes would also be useful given that the article and the quotations were all written in English.
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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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