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Author's response to reviews:

Editor

We very much appreciate the opportunity to submit a revised version of this paper, and your open-minded approach to our appeal.

We did consider the comments by reviewer 1 and note that we include many of the “best practices” for risk communication that he mentions (e.g. framing risk in both positive and negative terms and use of a visual display of risk). However, Waters’ paper concerned communicating risks about cancer to the public (hence advice such as “stop smoking”). Our work is giving risks of cancer outcomes to patients who already have cancer. Hence issues such as “compare risk of cancer to risk of other hazards” are not relevant.

We have made suitable changes to abstract and affiliations. We can confirm that there are no competing interests and that the patient in figure 3 is hypothetical.

We hope that the paper is now acceptable for publication.

Best

Andrew Vickers