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Advance directives in France: Do junior General practitioners want to improve their implementation and usage? A nationwide survey.

Sidonie Hubert, MD; Sarah Wainschtein, MD; Albane Hugues, MD; Caroline Schimpf, MD; Thècle Degroote, MD; Kelly Tiercelet, MSc; Marc Tran, MD; Cédric Bruel, MD; francois philippart, M.D., Ph.D.

BMC Medical Ethics
Editor Comments:

TITLE PAGE & ABSTRACT

1. Email addresses for all co-authors

Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page (excluding the REQUIEM group). The corresponding author should still be indicated.

Done

2. Please move the Keywords to the end of the Abstract. Please remove all word/figure/table counts from the Title page.

Done

MAIN TEXT


Done

DECLARATIONS

4. Ethics approval and consent to participate – clarify informed consent process.

Please clarify the statement, ‘Information was produced by the paragraph preceding the questionnaire.’ If this statement is in regards to ensuring informed consent, please provide all details in this section of the Declarations.
In French law, “non-opposition” means that the person / patient who does not express opposition after reading the information about the study / the survey is considered to be willing to take part. This corresponds to an implicit agreement.

We modified the sentence for : “Since the survey was done remotely, we add before the start of the survey a first paragraph indicating the aim of the survey and the possibility of the reader not to take part to the survey. We also indicated that data obtained in the survey will be analysed and published in a scientific journal. Participants were considered not to oppose the study if they answered the questionnaire without necessity to collect a formal agreement (“non-opposition”). “

5. Ethics approval and consent to participate – ethics committee approval.

Please include a statement on ethics approval and consent to participate in the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” statement of the Declarations section.

Please confirm whether your study was submitted to and approved by your institutional ethics committee and include a statement to this effect in your “ethical approval and consent to participate” section of your declarations. Please also ensure that the full name of your ethics committee is included in this statement. If the need for ethics approval was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.

The same sentences were added to the declarations section.

As a survey for physicians, our work did not need to be submitted to a national ethics committee. This point was however confirmed by our local ethics committee. As such we do not have an IRB.

We add the last sentence to the declarations section.

6. Ethics approval and consent to participate – approval of implied consent.

We note that in this section you have stated that, ‘Respondents were considered not to oppose the study if they answered the questionnaire.’ In this section, please clarify whether the ethics committee approved the form of consent implied upon return of completed questionnaire.
The “non-opposition” method correspond used in our study is the usual methodology recommended for such studies (non-interventional studies; cf. reference in previous response to reviewers) by French law. As such there was no need of specific approval of ethics committee.

The previous sentence was added to the specific section

7. Consent for publication

Currently, the statement in your “consent for publication” section of your declarations is incorrect. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

Done

8. Availability of data and materials

Please consider revising your statement in accordance with the following statement, ‘The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.’

Done

9. Authors’ contributions – details.

Please expand on the current statement and provide more detail on the specific contributions of each author to the manuscript.

Following information were added:
Conception and design: FP, SH, CB, MT: initiation of the study and rational of the study was initiated by FP based on previous works and written by FP and SH. Survey (choice of questions, sections, order of questions, formulation of questions) was conceptualized by FP, SH, MT and CB. Selection of pre-trial answerers and submission for valuation of clarity of each question was done by SH, CB and MT among a panel of non-potential survey responders.

Collection of data: SW, AH, TD, KT: Design of the internet survey, building of the specific web page were done by SW and AH. Collection of emails, information of medical students’ associations, medical educational journals was made by SW, AH and KT. Collection, synthesis and cleaning of the raw data file was made by TD. Specific analysis, classification in specific sub-questions, statistical analysis was made by TD, KT under FP supervision.

Drafting: FP, SW, AH, TD, CS: The first draft of the paper was written by SW and AH as a “writing training”. This draft was reread by two (blinded to each other) other members of the team (TD and CS). The two-corrected draft were sent to FP for a terminal synthesis and definite paper to be send.

10. Authors’ contributions – all read and approved.

Please include a statement in the Authors’ contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

Done

11. Acknowledgements

We note that you have not included an acknowledgements section. If you have no acknowledgements please put ‘Not Applicable’ in this section.

Done

FIGURES & FORMATTING
12. Figure 1 – source of map image

Please provide the source of the image of the map of France used in Figure 1. Please add this information to the Figure legend.

The used map was copied by SW (for her thesis) from a free of any right picture obtained on a government website.

13. Figure legend list

Please provide figure legends under the separate heading, 'Figure Legends,' which should be placed after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text or the figure files, please move them. Figure files should contain only the image, as well as any associated keys/annotations.

Done

14. Supplementary file list

Thank you for providing the survey as a Supplementary file. Please add a section "Additional files" (after the Figure legends list) where you list the following information for each additional-supplementary file in the file inventory:

- File name (e.g. Additional file 1)
- Title of data
- Description of data

Done
15. Clean manuscript

At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Done