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Reviewer's report:

Overall Comments

This is an interesting and important paper on the process of shared decision making among family caregivers of older adults. However, a sample size of 6 is vastly insufficient for generating a thorough understanding on the subject matter. Moreover, the depth of analysis as reflected by the descriptive quotes of each proposed theme is inadequate for a robust qualitative study where vivid experiences are emphasized. Thus, I recommend either that the authors recruit more participants for their research and continue data collection and analysis until data saturation, or carry out in-depth case studies for each of the 6 existing participants so as to provide the much needed contextual information in supporting their findings. In sum, a major revision of this paper is recommended.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. A sample size of 6 participants for a qualitative study is a major concern, despite the findings are consistent with other research in the same field. The descriptive quotes for some emergent themes are too brief with only a few words (i.e. “I decided it alone” (p.12); “Choices, options – there aren’t many” (p.13)) and lacking in supportive contextual information. A more appropriate way to analysis and present the data is through in-depth case study.

2. The authors stated that this research is embedded in a larger mixed methods study on the feasibility of SDM, hence, it may more appropriate to present both the qualitative data well as the relevant quantitative data to give this manuscript its much needed depth.

3. The authors did not clearly explain the reasons for presenting a 14-minute video on SDM before the qualitative interview. While this procedure can help participants recall and compare their own experience in decision making, it can also pose response bias. A detail elaboration on this method is critically needed.

4. The background information of participants were missing. Given the demographics such as age, education, income, and etc. play important role in decision making especially in family caregiving, the authors need to provide them.

5. The authors stated that a hybrid process of inductive and deductive thematic
analysis was adopted, whereby a priori template of codes was used. However, such template was not presented in the manuscript, and therefore the data analyze process remains unclear.

6. The findings of this study include a total of 11 themes grouped into 5 different categories. I have serious doubts about such large volume of findings given the limited number of participants. Also, it is also questionable whether the stated themes can be identified among most participants, as a number of themes were not even supported by descriptive quotes, and this puts into question the validity of interpretation.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The authors introduced the interprofesional approach to SDM on page 5; the model with the “two axes” needs more elaboration and clarification.

2. It would be useful to present all themes and categories in a table or figure for better reference.

3. The authors need to address the issues of subjectivity and reflectivity with one interviewer and with qualitative research in general.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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