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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and thought provoking account of a qualitative interview study on nurses' experiences with the practice of MAID in Canada. I read the paper with much interest and only have a few comments that may further strengthen the paper.

1. The study includes many perspectives, i.e. nurses from different regions, different professional levels, different levels of experience with MAID, different moral stances, and probably also different work settings. The interviews further addressed a broad range of MAID related topics. Whereas it seems unlikely that any degree of saturation has been reached, the study is probably best seen as an explorative study, which could be better explained in the discussion.

2. The authors only briefly discuss experiences outside Canada. They could try to better explain why this study is relevant for countries that do not have or have other MAID regulations.

3. Somewhat more discussion of characteristics of the sample may be justified, e.g. because nurses from BC and nurses with over 25 years of experiences seem overrepresented. Maybe also holds for other characteristics. I miss information about work setting.
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