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Reviewer's report:

General
As the authors comment, this is an important area to consider and it is interesting to read a study on patients wishes from a non-western country.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Please explain your inclusion and exclusion criteria a little more. Did you exclude all those with a psychotic diagnosis, or only those who were currently psychotic? If so it would be more accurate to state in the abstract and method that you were seeking the views of people newly attending outpatients with a non-psychotic illness. What is your age cut-point for being a "minor"?

Can you give a response rate? Did you recruit people consecutively? If not say it is a convenience sample.

You mention in the discussion that you found no association of answers with age, sex, income, educational background. This should be in the results. Also, if you have all this sociodemographic info, could you further described the sample - you dont mention education or income. You say you found correlation. This would not be the most appropriate statistical test in my view - how about chi squared for the categorical and t test (provided age normally distributed) for age? If you are going to say no significant results need to give test statistic and p value.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Could you explain what you mean by tertiary care hospital to ensure clarity for an international audience?

How did you come up with the item for the questionnaire initially? You say in the discussion that you talked to doctors and patients before making the questionnaire. It would be helpful to have this in the method.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I suggest putting the final paragraph of the methods higher up in the methods, where you discuss the questionnaire, to clarify that the questionnaire was developed first, then implemented.

I dont think you need table one and figure 1, I would just keep table one

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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