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Reviewer's report:

Summary.
The aim of the study was to determine whether there was a single best way of communicating risk and benefit of preventive treatment to patients. The authors used an extremely complicated design, and appear well aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the design, discussing these appropriately. The results contribute to the literature on risk communication to patients, and the conclusions drawn are appropriate.

There are some methodological flaws which a reviewer could take issue with, including the limiting of one interview format to each interview session, and the use of the general public rather than patients. Both these are well justified by the authors, and discussed appropriately in terms of limitations to the use of the results.
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