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Point-by-point response

Basel, 28th of October 2019

Dear Editorial Board

We refer to your e-mail sent to us on the 15th of October and would like to thank you and the external reviewer for going through our manuscript. We have now addressed all these points, please find the responses below. This time we have also submitted a track changes version of the manuscript which includes the track changes of our last resubmission.

Once again, we would be delighted to have our manuscript published by BMC Medical Ethics.

Marta Palmeirim and Jennifer Keiser (on behalf of all authors)

Reviewer 3:
Requested revisions:
• The randomization need to be written in a more clear way. Sample size need to be written in a more clear way.

We have carefully edited the statistical analysis and sample size section for clarity. If there are specific
changes please let us know.
• Table title need to be shorter.
  We have shortened the table title.
• Statistical analysis section need to be revised Mainly table 2 (More description is needed), I recommend consulting's a biostatistician.
  We have gone through this section for clarity, together with the biostatistician author of this manuscript.
  We are not exactly sure what specific changes the reviewer would like.

Additional requests and suggestions:
• The methodology is not clear and need more revision, statistical analysis section need to be reviewed.
  Again, we have made changes to this section and would ask the reviewer to be more specific if he/she feels more changes should be made.
• Table titles need to be shorter.
  The table title was shortened.
• Randomization and sample size to be written in a more clear way.
  We have edited this section for clarity. One limitation of the study, which was mentioned in the discussion, is that it was a complicated process which is, therefore, not easy to explain. We find it is now sufficiently clear and would ask the reviewer to let us know what else he/she would change if still not satisfied.