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PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: To view the full report from the academic peer reviewer, please see the attached file.

REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: An important study, asking important questions. Interesting findings eg "Our study finds an important willingness of young clinicians to take part in the implementation of ADs to their patients both by information about the existence of ADs and by their wish to help patients in the drafting of these ADs." Also that, "40% of responders affirmed they would not immediately transmit AD to hospital physician in case of patient admission" and "observations lead us to believe that much remains to be done, notably in the pedagogy of young clinicians in order to improve the autonomy of patients, whose advance directives are only one manifestation." It is good to have the survey monkey questionnaire used in the appendix to refer to and this is provided at the end of the manuscript.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Some countries use the phrase of living wills instead - should this be referred to?

In the background section it would useful to have a table or text to see what global views / figures there are in relation the advanced directives

"The aim of our study is to evaluate the new generation of clinicians thinking about ADs and their involvement in implementing them with their patients." - where?, this be stated - also this must differ between countries

September 2014 to November 2015 - the survey is 3 years old - will views have changed in this time in an area which receives a lot of media attention?

I am assuming this study was conducted in France (Some of this information is provided in table 1 and Figure 1 and as detailed in the ethics committee approval - this should be referred to in the text) - it would be useful if the author(s) could discuss the generalisability of the research.
"2310 residents filled out our survey. As indicated in the emails, GPRs who did not want to answer the questionnaire did not have to provide any reason." - do we know the response rate? Some of this information is provided in table 1.

Limitations of the study are not given in relation to where the study was conducted, a global background to the study and generalisability - this information is required and should form part of a revision. Also is the sample who answered the questionnaire representative of the population of General practitioner resident (GPR) internship doctors as a whole in France and beyond?

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

As detailed above

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.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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