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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well written manuscript addressing the link between preferences for involvement, shared decision making (SDM), decision conflict and satisfaction. The focus to link SDM to intermediate and long-term endpoints is original and a relevant contribution to the literature.

The study proposes a heuristic model and then appropriately uses a structural equation model to test it. Positive to note is the split sample approach (using a development and validation sample).

The paper has some other limitations, but they are all transparently discussed in the discussion section and mostly quite typical for this type of research. Therefore, the limitations put forward by the authors (e.g. recall bias, temporal relationships) should not prevent this manuscript from being published.

Major Compulsory Revision

My major concern is that the study uses a pooled set of data from “Gesundes Kinzigtal” which might attenuate the results, given intervention and control groups were pooled while “increasing patient involvement in clinical decisions” was a special focus of the overall project. I do not think that the use of a pooled dataset is appropriate here.

Other issues that I would like to ask the authors to comment on:

- Table 2: how does the sample differ from the population it was drawn from (potential selection bias)
- Table 3: goodness-of-fit appropriately reported, it would be useful though to report on the descriptive of the constructs in order to allow for comparison to other studies that used the same measure.
- All sources of data are derived from the same questionnaire: might this lead to common methods bias
- Inconsistent results regarding the association between patients’ preference for involvement and current involvement. In line with my major criticism above, this should be re-assessed taking separately into consideration the data from intervention and control group.
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