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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. Lay participants were recruited by means of an advertisement in a regional newspaper. This may have caused selection bias which is mentioned in the discussion but should be discussed (one or two sentences may be sufficient) – in what way may this have influenced the representation of the “lay” view on the subject matter?

2. The results subsection “Identification of people at risk” contains results which appear a bit misrepresented in the abstract: the results seem to be that lay people over-estimate the predictive power of genetic tests - rather than that predictive genetic testing is beneficial.

3. The results subsection “Motivation to adopt healthy behaviour” reports that the long-term effects of genetic information on preventive behaviour (which would have to be the case for benefits to arise) is uncertain which should be made more clearly.

4. In the discussion section, the authors state: “This may justify a public health approach, i.e. offering a genetic risk assessment and health messages to people who did not ask for it. Indeed, the issues mentioned by the lay participants and the professionals in the present study are comparable to non-genetic risk assessment and related to issues that are specifically relevant in public health.” This may be understood as a claim that it is a worthwhile measure to promote DNA testing, hoping that this would induce more healthy behaviour. Doesn't the remainder of the results section point into a different direction (that there is no evidence of such a positive effect)?

**- Minor Essential Revisions**

1. I don’t understand the sentence “One participant mentioned that a family history assessment should be voluntary, while most participants believed that the DNA test should never be performed unless asked for.” – doesn’t it say twice the same?

- **Discretionary Revisions**

1. The document should be restructured to focus more on differences between
the views of the different stakeholders.

2. Which incentives were provided to the participants? Were they paid? This may be an additional cause of selection bias and might be worthwhile to discuss with the role of selection bias.

3. Details on the interviews, e.g. the semi-structured interview guide should be published as an appendix
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