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Author's response to reviews:

To the Editor,

My coauthors and I are submitting the attached revised version of our manuscript - MS: 2081463053818974, Development and initial evaluation of a treatment decision dashboard. The changes from the prior submission made in response to the reviewers’ concerns are summarized below.

Reviewer 1, Oliver Hirsch, had no concerns to address.

Reviewer 2, Jan Horsky:

1. Consider renaming the background section

We have not changed the name of this section to be consistent with the journal formatting requirements.

2. Use a more appropriate term than “intervention” to describe what was done in the study.

We agree that what was done is not really an intervention and have renamed this section (on page 9) “Prototype Assessment”

3. Include more discussion about the participants stating they all would want to make a treatment decision in conjunction with their physician.

At the bottom of page 14, we have emphasized this point in our discussion of this finding which now concludes “…80% felt that a decision dashboard would be a valuable educational tool, either alone or in conjunction with complementary written material, to prepare them to participate in a shared decision making process with their health care provider.”

We have also changed the wording at the end of the limitations paragraph on page 15 from “… that the interactive dashboard format can be successfully adapted to create a patient decision aid capable of quickly and efficiently helping at least some people make a decision based on a large amount of complex data” to “… that the interactive dashboard format can be successfully adapted to
create a patient decision aid capable of quickly and efficiently helping at least some people identify preferred decision alternatives based on a large amount of complex data”.

Finally, also on page 16 in the paragraph just before the conclusion section, we have also added a need for further research to learn how to involve busy practitioners in the use of decision aid dashboards. The new statement reads: “Moreover, additional studies are needed to determine the amount and type of information clinical decision dashboards should contain, how to effectively involve busy practitioners in their use, and to explore the efficiency, effectiveness, and cost-effectiveness of using interactive dashboards to support patient-centered shared decision making in routine practice settings.”

4. Consider deleting Figure 2.

We have decided to retain figure 2, since the data it shows is not adequately reported elsewhere in the manuscript. However, we have changed the format from a box and whisker graph to a simple dot plot which seems more appropriate given the small data set. We have also added a detailed summary of these results as a new supplementary file.

5. Consider deleting or simplifying Table 3 describing the study sample

We have consolidated the education categories reported but made no other changes as we think it is important to describe the characteristics of our study sample adequately in this report.

In addition, we have also made a few minor wording changes and adjusted the format of the manuscript to comply with the manuscript formatting guidelines.

We hope these modifications satisfactorily address the reviewers’ concerns and that the current format of the manuscript is consistent with the journal requirements.

Please let me know if you have any questions or if additional changes need to be made.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

James Dolan MD
Department of Public Health Sciences
University of Rochester
Department of Community & Preventive Medicine
265 Crittenden Blvd.
CU 420644
Rochester, New York 14642-0644