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Reviewer's report:

This paper covers an important topic in the implementation of patient decision aids and communication aids in breast cancer clinical care.

There are a few Major Revisions I would suggest:

1. The description of how the communication aids were implemented is not very clear. Although this has apparently been reported in another paper, it is not clear to the readers of THIS article how the patients were contacted, how far in advance of appointments, what training were the staff given, was it always the interns job to do this or did nurses do it some of the time. How many attempts did they usually have to make to reach patients and those who weren't contacted....what were the reasons for that? What were the reasons for declining the communication aids? Only 25% of the consultations actually took this up...do you know why? What did the coaching on the phone actually comprise and how long did that take?

2. It is also not very clear what the 'question-asking sessions were'. How did they relate to the consultation with the specialist or are they one and the same?

3. It's important to get a better feeling for the types of patient demographics participating in this service...privately insured or not, literacy levels, languages other than English etc.. This is important for generalisability to other services who may want to implement DAs.

4. Care needs to be taken in making too much of the pre-post knowledge and self-efficacy data without a control or comparator group. Also the response rate was only 35% so likely substantial selection bias. Limitations on interpretation of this data should be more explicit in the paper.

5. The use of unpaid interns is novel and it is good to see cost estimates included in the evaluation. However, it highlights the additional resources required for successful implementation and it would be good to see the authors comment on the feasibility of this in other services.

Discretionary revision

1. I don't think the figures are helpful. The text descriptions of these results is enough.
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