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Reviewer's report:

This paper reports on important ethical and legal issues surrounding involuntary treatment. The interviews with 8 psychiatrists are interesting and informative, adding to our insight into the complexities and nuances of practice in difficult and challenging situations. It raises questions for further research, including the importance of doing long term follow up studies of outcomes for patients admitted involuntarily. It also suggests that further studies into the experiences of patients themselves who are admitted involuntarily would be of great interest in further enhancing our understanding of this vexed legal and ethical field.

Minor essential revisions:

Spelling errors:
4th line from bottom of paragraph under 'Swedish Mental Health Act', should read "confirmed" not "conformed"

Quote under paragraph headed 'Protecting patients from social harms': '...to protect them "from" (not 'form') themselves...'

Heading: "Respecting the patient's true will": this might read better as 'Respecting the patient's intentions"?

Sub -paragraph 3: better to express it as :"...would want, if they possessed adequate cognitive abilities..."

Heading: "The patient's social circumstances': quotation paragraph 2 - perhaps end after '...relatives that take care of them...'

I suggest that it might be helpful to readers to briefly describe the kinds of treatments that are provided to patients who are admitted involuntarily, particularly as one respondent refers to mandatory treatments as "brutal". For example, are patients admitted to secure facilities, or treated by compulsory community treatments, or medicated via injection etc. Knowing the nature of likely treatments may shed further light on the respondents' responses, and perhaps be discussed by the researchers if this usefully expands the debate.

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.