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Reviewer's report:

This RCT study evaluated "Effect of a Patient Decision Aid (PDA) for Type 2 Diabetes on Knowledge, Decisional Self-efficacy, and Decisional Conflict". The article was well written.

Introduction

The authors argued that "none addressed decisional self-efficacy". What is self-efficacy? Why is it important to include it in such a study? I would like to ask similar questions about "decisional conflict". A literature review and theoretical hypothesis needs to be presented in this section or perhaps in the Methods section.

Line 254-255: please describe how values of dependent variables were calculated.

Line 304: "Knowledge outcome" is a subheading (formatting issue).

Line 319: "PDA users, as compared to UC, had substantially larger improvements in both decisional 319 self-efficacy (3.7 vs 320 -3.9, respectively) and decisional conflict (-22.2 vs -7.5, respectively) within 6 weeks of enrolment" - How were those scores calculated? Reliability of the scales? Such information needs to be presented in the Methods section.
Line 314: "PDA use (versus usual care) was associated with a 26.6 percentage points gain in total knowledge score (p<0.0001) and a 10.1 points (p<0.0001) gain in knowledge confidence. (Table 4)" and Line 326: "PDA use was associated with a substantial decline in decisional conflict (-16.25 (p<0.0001)) and improvement in decisional self-efficacy (7.44 [p = 0.004]). (Table 4)" - Those two statements are not accurate/correct. Figures such as 26.6 were beta parameter, I assume. It indicates a likelihood of greater effect in comparison with the UC control group.

Line 403: "Error! 404 Bookmark not defined." - please correct the error.
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If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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