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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is an excellent and well written manuscripts. The authors have done a great job of responding to the prior reviewers concerns. The paper presents and interesting and underutilized approach to medical decision making through the use of the Dilemma Methods and the Nussbaum theory vs. the traditional 4 principles methods. I enjoyed reading this and find it applicable to clinical medical ethics.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1. Pg 8 line 49 - this sentence is unclear - "4 only used other methods", what were those methods? 2. The methods falls slightly short of what is expected for qualitative research. First, grounded theory is typically an approach to the collection of the data, although the authors distinguish they are utilizing a lesser know approach of grounded theory as a coding method and this may need further clarification. Next, the authors have not followed COREQ guidelines for the presentation of qualitative results - no details are provided on theoretical saturation, or saturation in regard to the recruitment of participants (why was the current number enough?), details are needed on inter-rater reliability and other forms of reliability and validity such as member checking, reflexivity for example. 3. It would be helpful if some demographic details were provided about the respondents in addition to their number - such as their profession or years of experience or age. 4. The paper would be improved if the dilemma method provided a context - can an example be given of the type of dilemma to which the respondents are discussing? One small example is given in the quote "not offering fertility treatment" but in general, the reader has no clue what the context is for these types of issues. 5. Line 23 page 17 - is this a typo? should it read "housed" instead of "hosed." 6. The discussion should be shortened, perhaps by not repeating the results in the first 2 paragraphs.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

As noted on the prior page, giving an example of the type of dilemmas discussed would provide context for a reader. Overall the paper is quite good and the authors do an excellent job of laying the groundwork in the introduction.

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.

Yes
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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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