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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
None

Discretionary Revisions

1. This is an excellent manuscript, but I would note that the authors chose to "evaluate" shared decision making purely from the perspective of professionals. One wonders what the patients' perspectives of the process were? In the context of the aims and presentation of the findings of this study, the issue is probably a minor one. However, one has to wonder about a commitment to "patient-centred care" when the voice of the patient is notorious by its absence from the manuscript. Perhaps this issue could be discussed briefly and reflexively in the introduction, discussion or strengths/weaknesses section, or by referring to other results if in preparation or published elsewhere.

2. The study design and methodology appear sound and the use of NPT as a lens for professional practice is valid and purposeful given the study's aims.

I was interested to note that the ethics board did not consider the study to constitute primary research. Do the authors have any views on that? Possibly an optional point for discussion.

The manuscript appears very well drafted and I could discern no spelling or typographical errors.

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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