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Reviewer's report:

Overall: The authors have revised the manuscript thoroughly in response to the reviewers’ comments. They have clarified the scope and purpose of the decision aid, and the interpretation of results is more balanced which includes framing it in a way that it raises questions to be addressed in future research.

Discretionary Revisions

1. The introduction has become disproportionally long with adding of background and impresses me as a narrative literature review, and the paper will benefit from tightening up the text that was added for the message to come across more clearly.

2. I do believe the Chang et al booklet is relevant to this manuscript although the topic (end of life) is different, it also deals with sensitive information in an Australian community setting. I appreciate the authors added reference to their evaluation paper even though they disagreed about its relevance. They authors may wish to add to the discussion the percentages that were in the response only, because it strengthens their point in that although a substantial minority of carers reported anxiety, they still wished to have the information.

Minor Essential Revisions

3. The abstract should also explain the nature of the decision aid (to help decisions regarding home services), similar as the added explanation in the main text

4. It is not sufficiently clear in the manuscript in what way the information was sensitive or disturbing or confronting or unrealistic. Providing some examples in the results will help the reader envision what the manuscript and the decision aid is about

5. The one figure that was maintained is missing in the revised manuscript

6. A limitation should be added in that there has been no direct observation of interaction between carers and health professionals.
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