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Reviewer's report:

I think that the authors have done a good job of satisfactorily addressed the comments made in the original review.

I have only a few minor comments for the authors:

* On Page 6, you have added information about how the vignette was designed. You write that "We further designed the vignette so that the disease in question should not be too common," but I'm not clear on the justification for making the disease uncommon. Can you elaborate on this?

* On Page 6 the following passage needs revision for sentence structure: "We have presupposed that if a physician's own trust in healthcare would increase, this would be tantamount to that physician claiming the act was good or desirable, and conversely. Those whose own trust would not be influenced would be interpreted as finding the decision ethically neutral."

Minor typographical errors

* On Page 12, Line 17 "although clinical research indicate" should read "although clinical research indicates."

* On Page 12, Line 23 "give rise" should read "gives rise."

* Page 13, Line 17 "Mix" should be "Mixed."

* Inconsistency between "pre-operative" and "preoperative" on Page 15, first paragraph.
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