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The study examines patients’ preferences for the presentation of complex risk information. How information about risks should be presented to the public is an important question.

Some of the data were collected in focus groups, some not. I’m not able to predict, whether the shortcomings of the paper can be corrected, without a more detailed description of how data were collected. More specific:

1.) Data from focus group discussions and one-to-one interviews were used. In a focus group discussion people may influence each other, therefore, I’m bothered that observations are treated as if they were independent from each other. A more detailed description of the group discussion might clarify this point (e.g., Were the preferences assessed before participants discussed the presentation form?).

2.) For non-caucasian women smaller differences were observed than for caucasian women (see Table 2). Is it possible that this result can be explained by the fact that non-caucasian women were tested in one-to-one interviews?

3.) The study did not test, which form of presentation is best understood by patients. Should we use the preferred presentation form or the presentation form that is best understood by most people. Do the authors expect that these two criterions are correlated? Some more elaboration could be helpful in assessing the relevance of the results.
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