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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports the combined results of two randomized controlled trials evaluating a prostate cancer screening intervention designed to promote shared decision making. The authors make an important observation about previous studies of prostate cancer screening decision aids considering informed decision making rather than evaluating interventions to promote shared decision making. This paper makes an important contribution to the field of decision aids and shared decision making interventions. Yet there are a few aspects of the manuscript which require additional clarification.

Major Compulsory Revisions

More information should be provided about the intervention beyond what is given in Table 1. In particular, the coaching session is a novel component of the intervention. It would help the reader to have more details about how the information in the coaching session was communicated, what materials were used, etc. If a script was followed, this might be included in an appendix. Some attention to the feasibility of the combined video/coaching session/physician intervention beyond this study should be given.

A secondary aim of the study was to explore the effects of framing prostate cancer screening in the context of other men’s health issues, but the study design is not entirely clear about how this aim was addressed. The control condition involved a video on highway safety. As described on page 7, it appears the intervention was framed within a broader context of men’s health issues for some intervention patients but not others. This aspect of the study design is not entirely clear.

Minor Essential Revisions

A limitation of the study is the inability to determine the independent effects of the video and coaching components of the intervention. Given the focus of the study is on promoting shared decision making, it would have been helpful to explore which components of the intervention led to specific outcomes consistent with SDM. This limitation should be acknowledged in the discussion.

The analyses for the outcome variable participation in decision making are also unclear. It appears the variable was coded as three groups, but the analyses imply the variable was collapsed further as shared participation versus the other
two participation groups.

Finally, the introduction should be updated to reflect the new USPSTF guideline on prostate cancer screening.

Overall, this is an important study of a prostate cancer screening intervention designed to impact shared decision making during clinical encounters. A unique aspect of the intervention is the inclusion of a coaching session for patients. A few additional points of clarification would further improve the presentation.
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