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Reviewer's report:

- this is an interesting and significant study.

- I am curious about the presumption that psychiatrists would not receive EAS requests from patients without psychiatric disorders. In Canada, for example, MAiD assessors and providers are not limited to seeing patients from their area of specialization about MAiD. Perhaps explain for international readers.

- lines 191-199 present very important data. They go directly to issues that are central to debates about EAS for psychiatric patients. I believe this should be included in the Abstract Results and reflected in the Abstract and full Conclusion section.

- lines 212-217 present very important data. They too should be included in the Abstract Results and Abstract and full Conclusion section (although if only 191-199 or 212-217 can be included, it should be 191-199 as that is new rather than temporally comparative data).

- lines 233-239 seems speculative without a grounding in the data. One can speculate that "some would argue" entirely other things.

- the Conclusion appears to have been drafted with a (perhaps unintentionally) negative normative bent. It is true that there is "much reticence" (i.e., 47% of the public), but "The majority of the general public support eligibility for EAS for people with psychiatric disorders." The authors could have concluded "there is very little strong opposition to..." (as "only 15% of the general public strongly oppose EAS for people with psychiatric disorders.") I am not advocating doing that - rather, I am demonstrating the problem of the normative bent. Similarly, rather than "less than two fifth...", the conclusion re: physicians could have been "almost half of general physicians..." (as "47% of general practitioners consider performing EAS with people with psychiatric disorders conceivable"...) Given that many readers will go straight to the Abstract and full Conclusion, I believe the content should be revised to avoid misleading readers (who don't read the whole thing) about the data from the study.
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