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Reviewer’s report:

This is a manuscript that describes a study in lung cancer patients with early stage disease who were given a choice of surgery or definitive radiation for treatment and their perceptions regarding their decision.

COMMENTS

1) Were patients all potential surgical candidates? It would seem that they would have to be if the 2 treatment options were discussed with them. This is unclear.

2) It seems incongruous that 80% of the patients felt that they had enough time to make a decision yet a fairly high number of patients still experienced decisional conflict. Do the authors have any explanation for this?

3) What was the compliance rate for the patients with regard to filling out the QoL forms?

4) Were parameters such as time the physician spent with the patient captured? Also did patients' outcomes change dependent on the physician involved with the decision making or was that not captured?

5) It is mentioned in the discussion that it is important to discuss survival and prognosis with the patients. I think this needs to be explained better. There are studies to indicate that patients want their physician to be honest but they do not necessarily want to hear survival statistics. Discussions like this may come with subsequent visits but not necessarily when one is discussing treatment that might be potentially curative.

6) The authors outline some of the limitations of the trial and there are certainly many in this type of study. What kind of study design would they use in the future to further investigate shared decision making?

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.

No

**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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