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Reviewer’s report:

I am not able to assess the medical information presented in the paper. I am reviewing the paper from the perspective of a researcher with expertise in the design and evaluation of health care technologies, including decision support technologies.

Generally the paper is well-written and presents an interesting piece of work. However, more information, both about relevant related work and the current work, needs to be provided.

Major compulsory revisions

1. The authors need to provide references in the background section to support their claims about clinicians' decision making (paragraph beginning 'As a result of data presented above...').

2. The authors need to provide references in the background section to support their claims about the benefits of patient decision aids (DAs). Please add examples of DAs and their impacts. Without this, there is not adequate justification for the work undertaken.

3. Under 'Platform design', justify your decision to develop a web-based DA.

4. Under 'Experts' feedback', state how many neonatologists and DA experts were included. Summarise the feedback that was given.

5. Under 'Parents' feedback', give some examples of the general comments that were given.

6. State clearly whether the participants in 'Parents' feedback' and 'Pilot testing of the Decision Aid' are the same or not.

7. Under 'Structure', give more information about how the information is presented, e.g. with images, as a series of bullet points etc.

8. The DA deals with a very sensitive issue. Explain how that impacted the design of the DA.

9. How parents would feel using the DA when actually making a decision about their child is not dealt with by the evaluation. Acknowledge this limitation and state what research you would undertake in order to explore how parents would feel in a real-world situation, eg. through interviews or focus groups.

10. Explain how you imagine parents using this DA, the scenarios of use. Would
there be a health care professional around to provide support?

11. The interpretation of the results ('positive feedback') conflicts with the numbers that are presented - the means are all less than 1.5 when responses were on a 5-point Likert scale with 5 as the highest. Are the numbers incorrect or is the interpretation incorrect? Please correct this.

Minor essential revisions

12. ELBW and PDA need to be defined in the abstract.

13. In the section on evidence sources, information is repeated from the background section. Please remove this (from 'Beneficial outcomes of prophylaxis...' to the end of the paragraph).

14. Please carefully proof read the paper for typos and errors.

Discretionary revisions
- None
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