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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports on an interview study with 27 men and women who received personalized cancer risk information and then were asked about their response to the form/type of information they received. The authors have provided detailed responses to reviewer comments, and the manuscript is much improved. The comments below address some remaining considerations.

Note that page numbers refer to the page numbers noted in the lower right margin of the page; line numbers refer to the numbers closest to the text.

1. The careful documentation of the cancer risk prediction tool in Lophatananon et al. (2017) is incredibly helpful and addresses concerns that I have had about the tool used in this current study (note, however, that this reference -- #33 - is incomplete). However, I am not clear - based on that article and this manuscript - how the personalized risk information was determined for participants who had a previous cancer diagnosis and, specifically, what they were told about the accuracy of the risk information they received. Although the inclusion of individuals with previous cancer is addressed in the Limitations section, the accuracy of the information they were given is not.

2. Although the rationale for an overall qualitative approach in this study and the specific qualitative/inductive foundation for the procedures (other than analysis) are limited, the authors do elaborate and clarify the analytic approach.

3. The Results, Discussion, and Table 1 address participant's area of deprivation (e.g., page 9, line 195; page 10, line 226). There should be information in the methods that identifies how area of deprivation was determined/measured.

4. Page 9 (line 198) - a citation should be included to support the statement about recommended fruit and vegetable intake.

5. Page 10 (line 225): I suspect the various perceptions of what constitutes high risk are presented in order of the frequency with which they were reported, but including that information would help clarify why the percentages are not presented in ascending or descending order.
6. The manuscript should be carefully proofread for indefinite nouns (e.g., page 11, line 235), formatting (e.g., page 9, line 194; page 11, line 237), and punctuation errors (e.g., page 4, line 78; page 5, lines 82 and 104; page 17, line 400).

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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