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Reviewer's report:

I found this manuscript to be very clear, well-written and timely. In particular, the authors did a nice job of highlighting the lack of discussion with doctors about screening in subsequent clinic visits, how the decision aid may lead to either increased or decreased preference for screening, and how the aid may attenuate pro-screening biases. However, i think caution is needed in assuming there is a pro-screening bias among individuals at risk for lung cancer given the newness of screening guidelines and the lack of (at least in the public's mind) effective treatments for lung cancer.

A few other specific areas of the manuscript that may require edits:

1. In the Results section of the Abstract, clarify that screening behaviors were only assessed for 36 patients because only 36 of the 50 had a provider visit. (This point was not clear until i read the results section of the manuscript.)
2. In study limitations, please address the low enrollment rates (13% of those reached by phone completed study visit and about 46% reached by phone declined). What were common reasons for declining participation? How might this have impact their results? Is the sample biased?
3. Also, in limitations, note that knowledge was assessed immediately following completion of the decision aid and may not reflect long term retention of lung cancer screening information.
4. Discussions of Mazzone et al findings on page 13 were confusing (lines 26-33) and seemed out of place (lines 41-43).
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