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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for allowing me to review this work. It is an interesting work on construct validity that involves structural and cross-cultural validity of SDM-Q-9 after its translation, generating evidence that support the inference that the original instrument and the newly developed one, culturally to be adapted are equivalent.

Major concerns

1. Sample size is not mentioned?

2. Acceptance rate of questionnaire items is not mentioned and if few items were not answered what was done?

3. Paragraph that starts at line no 53, page-3 to line no 9 page-4 needs more details on how the scale was framed based on the two options of comparability and interpretability. The scale presented contain only the extreme values, a complete scale from extremely comparable to nothing comparable should be presented.

Minor concerns

1. Language needs edition by a native speaker.

2. Few sentences need revisions.

Details

Abstract

1. In line 42 of methods section of the abstract, in the sentence "The reliability of the questionnaire was evaluated and its validation was made by exploratory factor analysis--" It
is better to be specific that " The reliability of the questionnaire was evaluated and its structural validity was verified by---.

2. In line-2: of conclusion section of the abstract, the sentence reads "displayed liability and validity" needs correction to displayed reliability and validity

Background

3. In general, I think that the introduction is well organized, however, in text referencing does not comply with journal guidelines of square brackets.

4. Language needs an overall improvement.

5. In line no 17 sentence that states "election of treatment" can be changed to selection of treatment.

3. Line 20 "Shared decision making (SDM) is a model where all steps are included in the treatment that must be taken for the disease" This sentence needs complete revision.

6. Line 41, the sentence that starts as "However, the perspective---"and the subsequent sentence needs a revision.

Methods section is partly clear

7. Again the language is partly clear.

Translation section under methods

8. Line no 38, "translation was carried out by two people" can be stated as "Two native speakers with fluent command of Spanish and English languages independently translated---"

9. Paragraph that starts at line no 53, page-3 to line no 9 page-4 needs more details on how the scale was framed based on the two options of comparability and interpretability. The scale presented contain only the extreme values, a complete scale from extremely comparable to nothing comparable should be presented.

Sample and procedure

10. How was the sample size arrived at is not mentioned.
11. What was the reason of completing the questionnaire on socio-demographic characteristics before consultation is not clear, it may be to save time or any specific reason has not been mentioned?

13. What was the acceptance rate of questionnaire items is not mentioned and if few items were not answered what was done.

14. How was the SDM-Q-9 questionnaire filled, was it self-administered or was it a face-to-face interview?

15. In data analysis section, third sentence "the normal variables, the Pearson" what the author's mean by "normal variables" is not clear.

Results

16. Table on demographic characteristics presents entries in the frequencies column and p-value column separated by commas instead of decimals.

Discussion

17. Discussion is well organized.

18. Line 51 page 7, the sentence starting as "these results" needs a revision for language.

Conclusions

19. The first line in conclusion section the word liability needs to be replaced by reliability.

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.

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

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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