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Reviewer's report:

The statistical analyses performed by the authors on the data in the paper are very appropriate and results are well reported. The tables are clear and self-descriptive.

Only few comments are reported hereafter.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) In the section 'Analyses', the authors wrote that they have used mixed effects model. The request is to specify the type of model: 'mixed effect logistic regression models' when the independent variable is categorical, and 'mixed effect linear regression models' when the independent variable is continuous.

Minor Essential Revisions

2) In the section 'Results', the authors reported the adjusted p-values. It is not clear from the text what 'adjusted' means, and the definition is given only in Table 2. Please, report the definition also in section 'Results' for ease of understanding.

3) In the section 'Methods', in Participants' use of and feelings about the decision aid', the sentence "To summarize .......risk reduction options." is very unclear, specially the stratification of the mean amount of time spent with the tool by risk level, please clarify this concept in the paper.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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