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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have rewritten most parts of the manuscript, especially the results section. Thanks to these changes, the reader can understand and evaluate the results much better than in the previous version. However, some of the questions raised before remain unanswered and some new questions come up while rereading the manuscript.

**Major**

I am still not convinced that the abstract is clear to the readers. In the background section “assessment procedures” were mentioned and in my opinion the authors mean decision rules or guidelines.

The presentation of the results is still narrative and a clear hypotheses or research focus is missing. I am not sure whether it is possible to condense the material to narrower but clearer meaning. One sentence in the results section does already point to this problem: “They also rated and identified SEVERAL FACTORS that influenced allocation decisions and patients decisions regarding testing.” Unfortunately, this sentence does not contain any specific information which might be due to the fact that the results itself are broad and unspecific.

A pilot study is generally an empirical investigation to test whether the methods for a main study are appropriate or to test the feasibility of an empirical approach. The presented results are based on a small sample which does not mean that this is pilot study at all, since the main study has different goals and uses a different approach.

The discussion section is unrelated to the results of the study. Also, the conclusion section goes far beyond the empirical evidence found in the data. Sometimes it reads more like a political statement than an empirical investigation. The authors should have a more neutral position in the interpretation of the “results”.

The study was funded by Genome Canada which might have interfered with the results and their interpretation by the authors. Could you please give to the reviewers some information about this organization? Furthermore, it would be interesting to know whether the results reported by the authors are in agreement with the position of the funding organization or not. Another possible threat to the
Data could be a self-selection bias of the interviewees, based on the motivation not to take part in this study due to the funding organization. Could you please state how the workshop in Banff was announced and whether the participants were informed about the funding organization.

Minor

Abstract: the naming of the states is not necessary.

Abstract: please mention the method of analysis.

Abstract: What is meant with “a national evaluation process for predictive testing”?

Page 4: what is the message of the first sentence in the second paragraph? What could be the value? The Discussion gives some information on that.

Page 5: some details about the methods were described and should be removed to the methods section.

Page 7: “all interviews were conducted by the same individuals”. Does this mean that several persons did the interviews? How many interviewers were involved? Is there any information about interview quality?

Page 8: BRCA1 instead of BRAC1

Discussion: were any of the results unexpected?
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