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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

This is an interesting manuscript, however I a few major concerns about the presentation of results and interpretation.

1. I found it very difficult to understand the labels given to the groups (eg verbal negative unbalanced) and to get a feel for what the differences between the groups were. I think the choice of labels needs some thought or at least there needs to be a much clearer description of what the labels mean. Perhaps an example vignette and the possible responses would help this?

2. With such a low response rate and the variation in response across the countries I find it difficult to know whether any differences seen are 'real'. It is not clear from the text what factors have been included in the multivariable adjustment (although it is in the tables). The authors need to make it very clear that any differences by country are require further investigation.

3. Following on from point 2, I personally find the differences between GPs and breast surgeons more interesting and it may be better to place more emphasis on that rather than on the country differences.

Minor essential revisions

1. Abstract results - 'The most frequent one was characterised by positively unbalanced risks and by the fact that only 2.9% stated that they would present the probability not to present cancer'. I do not understand this sentence - positively unbalanced suggests that they are presenting an overly positive view but this is at odds with not presenting the probability to not develop cancer. It doesn't make sense to me, please re-phrase. This also applies to the results, line 201.

2. Introduction, line 73 - 'Presently faced with...' This sentence does not make sense. Please re-phrase.

3. Introduction, line 81 - Move the objective to end of the paragraph.

4. Methods - state what is included in the statistical adjustment.

5. Discussion, line 241 - change 'family' to 'family history' to be clear that it does
not relate to contraception.
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