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**Reviewer's report:**

Grispen et al. presented the results of randomized controlled trial assessing the effects of a web-based decision aid on the intention to self-test for cholesterol and diabetes. I have some comments/clarifications, in particular about the methodology.

1. Abstract, Methods: Authors should briefly provide specific information such as 1) age of the participants 2) number of participants under each arm at baseline 3) type/content of DA 4) outcome measures assessed (authors mentioned one of the aims was to assess the socio-cognitive determinants, this should be specified) and 5) type of intervention received by the two groups etc.

Main Manuscript

**Methods:**

2. Authors should state the hypotheses to be tested at the outset.

3. Outcomes: HBM questionnaire- Has this been validated? Authors should specify how they define each of the HBM concepts based on the questionnaire items (such as scoring based on how many items).

4. Demographic characteristics: Have the authors assessed marital status and family history of diabetes/cholesterol at baseline?

5. Statistical analysis: Type of analysis, is it an intention-to-treat analysis?

6. Is there any difference in characteristics between those who participated in the follow-up and those who were lost to follow-up?

7. Were the results similar combining the two intervention groups vs. the two control groups given that the two intervention groups did not differ significantly in baseline characteristics.
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