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Reviewer's report:

The results present unadjusted and adjusted analyses of responses to a survey of medical students about willingness to participate in MAID. The presentation of results is clear and generally appropriate.

General comments: The methods are not fully detailed and for example, don't mention the use of stepwise model selection (presented line 168), nor the use of what I think may be mixed effects models (suggested by the phrasing on line 155/156). There is no evidence of survey weights or similar design adjustments. The use or non-use of mixed effects models must be clarified, and the use of such would be recommended. Mixed effects models or generalised estimating equations (treating province or University, or both as clusters) would be a more robust approach to the multivariable models, allowing for the incorporation and consideration of potentially correlated data.

The only mandatory change is to fully clarify the approaches and models used in the methods section.

Line 157: I would recommend caution in over interpreting statistically significant interaction effects. Generally, sample sizes must be considerably larger to have confidence in estimates of interactions.

Line 168: Stepwise methods of model selection are largely regarded as misleading and inappropriate, especially for inferential (compared to predictive) modelling approaches. I would encourage the authors to consider carefully the theoretical model (ie the causal model) they posit, and then apply a multivariable model that includes the primary exposures of interest and any measured confounders.
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