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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is one of the best papers I have reviewed for a journal. The creative use of a qualitative study methodology yields unique insights into the experiences of patients, surgeons, and issues of informed consent for surgery. The paper is uniformly well-written, clear, and the authors have covered all their bases. At first I was concerned with the small sample, but given the extensive interviewing involved and the random method by which the sample was chosen, I am convinced that this study results in genuine insight into problematic behavior by surgeons regarding informed consent and its effect on patient trust of surgeons. The authors also admit that the size of their sample is small, and invite other studies along this line.
Their presuppositions behind the study are made clear as well as its limitations. The focus on the narratives of patients is a promising one -- the authors are correct that human beings understand their lives in terms of stories rather than in terms of abstractions. Only by going beyond the quantitative into the qualitative by listening to patient's stories can a fully-embodied view of patients' experiences with surgeons can be articulated. This paper is clearly worthy of publication and contributes a great deal to the field of informed consent in medical ethics.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
I think this paper is publishable as is; however, there are some minor stylistic points that the authors are free to use or not use as they see fit. On p. 12, around the numbers 12 and 13 on the left side of the page (lines 5-6 in my printout), there is a lack of parallel structure--it may be better to insert "deficiency in" before "implementation of regulatory guidelines." On the next page, line 2, a comma should be inserted between "discussion" and "and yet it did not take place." I am not sure that the commas on p. 21, line 1 after "conduct" and line 3 after "manner" should be there. On p. 30, reference #12, there is a "1" after "consent" that I am not sure should be there. On p. 31, reference 20, a period should be inserted after "Methods".

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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:
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