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Reviewer's report:

The Methods section is now better focused on the development and evaluation of the prototype. Minor notes: You may want to rename Background to Introduction since the section contains both (customary distinction) or select another title (more in line with the structure of the paper). Also, Intervention in this sense is a bit of a misnomer since there is no control group or a reference standard for comparison. The qualitative results are perhaps the best part of the report, given the insufficient reliability of self-reported evaluation. The finding on p 14 that all respondents wanted to make ultimately their decision in conjunction with their physician is significant and should be discussed in the context of practical implementation as a shared decision tool. You already note that the dashboard should have primarily an educational purpose and help prepare for a discussion with the physician rather than used as a standalone tool; further discussion is warranted.

Figure 2 is not informative and does not convey any new information over results already reported - you may skip that along with the overly detailed table with cohort description.
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