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Reviewer’s report:

Reviewers Dr Darren Flynn and Professor Richard Thomson

The manuscript is a substantial improvement on the first submission, and the majority of reviewer comments have been satisfactorily addressed. We have some further comments, which would help to strengthen the quality of the revised manuscript:

• Suggest the authors rephrase sentence on p6 (para 2, line 2) to refer specifically to ‘preference’ for involvement in decision making and preference for available treatments, including highlighting that shared decision making is the optimal approach when available treatment options have similar effectiveness, but different risk profiles and consequences in the short and long-term, which individuals are likely to value differently.

• The sampling for recruitment stated on p9 “using local community-based non-forensic secondary mental health services” is still somewhat ambiguous – would the following be a better description? secondary care settings such as outpatient departments/clinics attached to a hospital

• The method section is overlong, and would benefit from shortening to enhance readability. Could some of this information be located in a web appendix? For example, details of ethics committees, details of the different measures used to assess validity on pp10-11 (or presented in tabular format).

• On the pp15/16 “A decision was defined as a topic which was (a) discussed, with the result that (b) either changes were made or there was agreement that no changes should be made”. This is vague and it would be most helpful to readers if the authors provided a definition that captures the range of ‘changes’ that would be considered a decision such as changes related to medication (type, dosage, frequency, discontinuation), social care/living arrangements, psychological therapies, self-management support/coping, frequency of appointments, return to employment etc

• “Satisfaction sub-scale had internal consistency of 0.89 (0.86-0.89 after item-level deletion)” is stated in the abstract – would it be preferable to omit the text in brackets in order to avoid confusion as no items were removed?
• Correct typo on page 19 “preferred syle” – should be preferred style

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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