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Author’s response to reviews

Dear Dr. Jox,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the reviewers’ final comments and to revise our manuscript for consideration for publication in BMC Medical Ethics. Below, please find our item-by-item responses to all the reviewers’ comments, which are included verbatim. All page and paragraph numbers refer to locations in the revised, clean version of the manuscript.

Klaus Bally (Reviewer 1) Comments: N/A

Marie-Eve Bouthillier, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2) Comments:

Comment 1: I thank the authors for the revisions made. I am comfortable with most of the changes. I must admit that I find the definition of PHD less convincing, but still acceptable in the specific context of your study. Only one important element must be notified to you. Assisted suicide is not technically illegal in Quebec (it is allowed in Canada and Quebec, as a province, is subject to Canadian laws). This is a very complex legal issue, a federal/provincial one... The Quebec law - The Act respecting end of life care- only provides for the administration of a lethal drug and does not regulate the practice of assisted suicide. Therefore, this practice is not regulated in Quebec, and the College of physician is against it. So I wouldn't use the term "illegal" to describe what is going on.

I would recommend another phrasing, eg. : Their reluctance may be underscored by the fact that lethal prescription in Quebec is currently not a regulated practice by the Act respecting end of life care in Quebec and by the College of Physicians of Quebec.
Response 1:
Thank you, Dr. Bouthillier, for your insightful comments and taking the time to review our revisions. You raised excellent points and we amended our manuscript as you have suggested. Please see pg. 15, line 6.

Mathieu Bernard (Reviewer 3) Comments:
Comment 1: I would like to thank the authors of this manuscript for having carefully considered all the remarks and comments from all the reviewers. I have only minor suggestions now:
1. I would clearly mention in the text that PGY 3 residents are excluded because some of them could have chosen a specialization in palliative care ("residents in enhanced skills programs" may not be sufficiently explicit).

Response 1:
Thank you, Dr. Bernard, for your thoughtful comments and for taking the time to review our revised paper. We have revised our manuscript to make this more clear. Please see pg. 7, line 9.

Comment 2:
2. If I am not wrong, the names of the supplementary tables 1 and 2 have not been changed as mention in their response to comment 15.

Response 2:
Thank you for highlighting this oversight. The heading for Supplemental Table 1 has been corrected. The title now reads “SUPPLEMENTAL Table 1: Logistic Regression Models to Examine the Influence of Clinical Exposure to Death and Dying on Residents’ Willingness to Participate in MAID”. Please see pgs. 28 and 29.

Comment 3:
3. The first sentence under the tables explaining the aim of the regression analyses is very useful but I would rather insert it in the text and not directly under the table. Once again, thank you to authors for the work realized in view of this second submission.

Response 3:
Thank you, again, Dr. Bernard for your helpful comments. We have removed these sentences from the logistic regression table legends of Table 2 and Supplemental Table 1 as per your suggestion (see pgs 27 and 28). This information can also be found within the main text (see pg. 11, line 10).