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Reviewer's report:

In general, the topic of this study is interesting. However, the manuscript has some major deficiencies that should be revised before publication. I have detailed some revisions below:

1. Introduction.
   1.1. The background information in general is informative. However, there are some issues that have not been mentioned. The authors should include some information about the screening of diabetes (e.g. procedure) and the specific implications of diabetes screening in order to demonstrate the necessity of informed choice. Also a definition of informed choice should be included in the introduction.
   1.2. The lines 11-12 in the first paragraph of the introduction are not clear.
   1.3. The authors should specify if the findings of the meta-analysis of studies using the theory-planned behaviour were statistical significant.
   1.4. The lines 4-11 in the last paragraph of the introduction (subsection of ‘the present study’) are very confusing and need to be clarified.
   1.5. The authors state that the aim of the present study is ‘to test a model of the impact….to facilitate informed choice’. A model is usually tested when there is a sufficient theoretical or empirical basis to make strong assumptions about how observed variables relate to the unobservable latent constructs and how latent constructs are associated with one another. Modelling using AMOS or LISREL is a theory driven and not a data driven procedure. Therefore, the authors should state if they have developed the path model based on a new theoretical framework that they have constructed or on a previous broader theoretical framework (e.g. Theory of Planned Behaviour). In that case they should describe the theoretical framework in the section of the introduction.

2. Methods
   2.1. When was the research conducted?
   2.2. The authors state that the informed choice invitation contained information regarding the potential harms attending for screening. I would suggest you to write some of the potential harms in order to be more precise.
   2.3. The attitude scale contains the exact items of the attitude scale of MMIC which has been used for antenatal screening. This has to be cited. Otherwise, it
seems that the attitude scale has been developed by the authors of this study.

2.4. The authors should provide some information regarding the development of the knowledge scale and the range of scores of the attitude scale and the knowledge scale.

2.5. The authors should provide information regarding the testing of the goodness of fit of the model. Usually, the goodness of fit of the model to the data is evaluated using a number of absolute and comparative fit indices. In this study which were the fit indices that were used and which are the prices of these indices?

2.6. Was the study protocol approved by an ethical and research committee?

3. Results

3.1. In the two last lines of the second paragraph of the result section the authors write that ‘there were no group differences in age….’. Do you mean that there were no differences between the participants and the non-participants or between the standard and the informed choice group?

3.2. Avoid citing references (e.g. Keller et al) in the section of results. Every comparison between your findings and findings of previous studies has to be referred in the discussion section.

3.3. The authors should define if higher score means better or worst knowledge and more positive or negative attitude.

3.4. In second and third line of the fifth paragraph of the results the authors refer that the fit was of borderline adequacy. This is confusing and it is not clear these fit indices on which model referred to.

3.5. The authors state that the invitation type did not impact upon attitude directly. How did they find this? There is not a direct path from invitation type to attitude (as there is from knowledge to intention) in the diagram in order to discover if there is a direct impact of invitation type on attitude.

4. Discussion.

4.1. The discussion of the study is generally well developed.

However, the authors should develop a subsection regarding the implications for practice and for future research (e.g. which are the factors that may impact on attitudes).

Overall was an important study.

I hope that you will find my comments helpful.
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