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Reviewer’s report:

#1. In the 2nd page of case section, line 33-40, you already highlighted the four important questions. Could you add table 1 to show the explicit questions of Mrs. W's condition. You may list the possible solutions for the four questions.

#2. In the 2nd page of discussion section, line 13-31, you already compared this deliberation framework with "Four Quadrants Method". However, you could also showed the difference between your framework and "SWOT strategy- Strength Weakness, Opportunity, Threat". I think this may let us know more about the novelty of your framework.

#3. In the 2nd page of discussion section, line 47-60, and the 3rd page of discussion section, line 1-3. To weight the effectiveness may exist difference between countries. You may reference the following review articles showing the concepts of shared decision making in oriental countries. You may design a conceptual framework, including the thinking process and action plan as figure 1 to express the structure of deliberation framework. Please see the Figure 2 of reference 2 [ J Formos Med Assoc 2013 Oct;112(10):589-99].

Reference:


Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown? 
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review? 
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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