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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is clearly improved.

I have only minor suggestions.

In the abstract, the word "perfectly" is used. I would delete this word and just say "These principles are in line with the..."

In the first paragraph of the background section, it states, "...and the withdrawal of any medical treatment, nutrition and hydration." Do you mean "...and the withdrawal of any medical treatment AND nutrition and hydration."?

In the first paragraph of the specific points section, the words "exalts" is used. Maybe "highlights" is a better word. Later in the same paragraph, it says, "...the principle of respect for the patients' autonomy in which his/her..." I think it would be better to say, "...the principle of respect for a patient's autonomy in which his/her..."

In the communication time section it states, "A growing body of evidence indicates...also in the hospital setting..." Is "also in the hospital setting" needed?

In the paragraph just BEFORE the shared care planning section, it states, "...healthcare professionals have the right and duty to be trained..." I think it's better and more appropriate to say "...healthcare professionals should be trained..." Also, later on, does "the law recommends" or does "the law implies"?

The first sentence of the second paragraph of the advance treatment directives section ("The aim of ADs...") can be deleted as the sentence that follows states the same/is redundant.
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