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Reviewer’s report:

This is an important clinical topic.

Minor points:
page 5; line 5-6 - please expand on 'autonomy (which comes in degrees)';
page 21 onwards; the reference to Al Quran is culturally appropriate given the population of patients studied, although the authors would make the same point in the absence of multiple passages of quoted teachings from Al Quran.

Page 20 – Discussion – what are the implications for reader?

Major points:
Introduction - this section would benefit from a re-write with a view to provide a more succinct overview of the problem and building of a rationale for this work. The content is correct although too much of it. Currently the a-e list embedded in various paragraphs is a confusing approach for outlining an argument in academic work. I advise streamlining to allow key issues/ gaps in the literature that this study will address to come to the fore.

Method - what methods and measures were used to determine acceptability, comprehensibility and stability? There is no evidence of objective measurement; please give specific operationalized details. In particular, the questionnaires are similar in content and wording and I'm looking for reassurance that patients would be able to understand the differences in what was being asked. Whilst I note a member of staff was on hand to explain these differences, a short pilot of 10 trials with patients may not be sufficient to ensure comprehension of the options provided in each list. Cognitive interviews in survey development would help strengthen your assurances around acceptability and comprehensibility. A patient-generated list of terms from focus group or interviews might have been more suitable here for patients. As a result, this brings into question the strength of the conclusions that can be drawn from the options patient choose and the study team’s interpretation of those i.e. ‘patient’s prefer a model of Mill’s individual autonomy’.

This article would benefit from extensive editing in terms of spelling and grammar prior to publication. In particular, the results section within the abstract would benefit from re-writing and perhaps carefully choosing the most salient results with more synthesis and interpretation of findings demonstrated.
**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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