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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper on an area of practice worthy of attention. Study of the cultural specificity of many of our western precepts of practice is still a small field and deserves more attention, such as the authors seek here.

The initial aim of the paper is clear, but it is clouded in the latter part of the methods section by the introduction of the CARE measure. From this point it is unclear if the paper is a local validation of the CARE framework or a qualitative review of patient views.

I would recommend that the authors reevaluate the paper and decide if it is about CARE, in which case this should be included in the background literature section, or if it is a study of patient perceptions in Hong Kong in which case the CARE framework may be introduced as part of the discussion and the comparisons claimed set out there.

At present the reader has to take the authors word that the frameworks coincide. The topic of "additional themes" is somewhat dismissed once the CARE framework is adopted.

In the methods it would be helpful to see the "purposeive selection" rules and also the schedule of "open ended prompts" as both may introduce certain biases and disclosure will strengthen the authors conclusions.

Some more reporting of weighting of findings, as is given in the empowering/treatment plan section where two out of twenty one patients are reported. Other items do not share this level of detail.

The results are interesting in themselves and worth publication.
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