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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review the paper. Overall the revisions have improved the paper and address the questions raised during the review process.

The authors outline the strength of their study design in relation to internal validity - limitations in terms of generalisability are acknowledged in the paper.

It is obvious after reviewing the on-line decision-aid materials that much time, care and attention has been paid to the development of the decision-aid booklet in terms of content and presentation. For this reason it would be important to pursue research around generalisability and to explore its potential value in a wider range of clinical practice environments. Plans for future research, as well as specific research questions that have arisen from the study, could be usefully included in the discussion.

In order to increase the paper’s relevance to clinicians, identification of the key implications for pregnancy care should be highlighted in the concluding comments.

Minor Revisions:

Even though the published protocol outlines the basis for power calculations regarding knowledge scores, it would be helpful if a brief summary of this information could be included in the description of ‘sample size’ within the paper.

The DCS scores in Table 2 (31.41 and 31.20 respectively) should be rounded to one decimal place to be consistent with the DCS scores in Table 3 (31.4 and 31.2).
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