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Reviewer’s report:

This paper has greatly improved, and I am satisfied with responses to my earlier comments.

Few minor essential revisions:

Page 1: Harding Center for Risk Literacy = Literacy?

Page 4: “perceived” is spelled wrong in the following sentence. Also the sentence would be more complete by adding: “of the risk”

“Forthermore, cardiovascular risk is often perceived inappropriately by primary care patients, leading to over- or underestimation of the risk.”

Page 14: Add to ref 45 that the study considered clinical geneticists (not GPs). See suggestion below....”as was shown e.g. for clinical geneticists.”

“Asked for a personal opinion, the physician may prefer verbal communication formats to others, taking the risk of inducing different meanings and confusion in patients. Similarly, by purposes like reassuring or persuading, GPs may prefer verbal formats, as was shown e.g. for clinical geneticists (45).”

Fig 2: Label “perceived understanding” is spelled wrong.

“Difference between the communication formats regarding to the mean estimates of subjectively perceived understanding”

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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