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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors/dear Editors

This is a well written text, very useful for other clinical ethicists and/or people working in the field of clinical ethics support. The methods are very well explained, the qualitative research approach is suitable. The text is definitely worth to be published.

As a minor form of critique ..., or lets say, as an idea for the next text: The text is written in a very descriptive way. I miss a more normative reflection about the possibilities (or non-possibility) to "evaluate" ethics in those kind of settings. Those kind of descriptibe texts have been published quite often lately. More or less: they all come with the same conclusion: ethics can help (can have significant effect). But is "significance" the right term to evaluate an ethics intervention with? Or do we have to move beyond this natural science based ideas of intervention/evaluation? So, Maybe these more epistemological thoughts about ethics can be a source for a next text. For the moment, my congratulations to this one at hand.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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