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Reviewer's report:

I enjoyed reading your manuscript. Two minor comments you might want to look at.

1) To me, the key-point you're making with your conclusion in your abstract is different from the key-point you're making with your conclusion of the entire manuscript. The key-point in the conclusion of your manuscript for me lies on finding a 'consensus that respects the patient autonomy while also accommodating those that would prefer to be guided by a trusted source'. Personally, I'd choose this also as a key-point for the conclusion of your abstract.

2) In your introduction, lines 89-91, you make the connection (or at least that is how I read it) that a reduction in uptake, even though people gained more knowledge, indicates a lack of informed decision making. But people, of course, can also make an informed decision not to participate. It is possible that people after gaining more information choose not to participate because they believe that for their personal situation the possible risks do not outweigh the possible benefits.
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