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Reviewer's report:

I read the article with interest. There are some methodological difficulties that require clarifications before the article can be published. There are also some other small matters. These can be rectified. Please see below.

The response rate of 10% is very low, certainly much lower compared to what is usually regarded as an acceptable sample (30%). Please explain the reasons for the low response, and why you did not insist to have a wider response.

How representative is the sample? Every piece of data that you relate to the sample should be equated to the general practitioner population in Israel.

The issue of religion that one may assume is of particular relevance in Israel's end of life decision-making is missing. How many of the physicians are religious? How many of them work in religious institutions? Are the responses of religious physicians similar to the rest?

Specific points:

p. 4, line 14: truth telling.

p. 4, bottom; The Netherlands and Belgium legislation is not recent.

p. 6, line 2: ethical standards.
p. 6, line 41: repetitive. Delete from 2926 to 10%.

p. 7, line 11: rephrase on the expense…


p. 7, bottom: relate to religion and religious hospitals.

p. 9, line 31: DAD appears to depend…

p. 9, last line: different specialization.

p. 9, bottom: religion? Religious hospitals?

p. 13, line 11: delete the, before the


Address the issue of religion and religious hospitals.

p. 15, line 1: worthy of consideration

p. 15, line 10: does not dominate

p. 16, second para: Evidence is required regarding the medical culture in Italy and Hungary.

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

No

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.

Unable to assess

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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