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Reviewer’s report:

The revisions overall improve the manuscript. I have the following suggestions for final edits:

You modify education as both genetic education and genetics education. I do believe the latter is proper-use that one consistently throughout the manuscript.

There is a need to add a limitations section to the end of the discussion that includes threats to the validity of the study. One important one is the lack of validity and reliability data from factor analysis of the scales that aim to represent a construct. It is not sufficient to merely state that factor analysis will be conducted at a future time. In fact, I recommend deleting that statement as it adds nothing to the manuscript: "Further research to address all facets of TPB factor formulation will develop the content validity of proposed factors." Please be clear and cautious about your limitations in using novel scales in the limitations.

Public is used without modification. It should read The public. Similarly TPB is used without The in front of it. As it stands for Theory of Planned Behavior it should be modified by The.

This sentence starts with a numeral that should be spelled out in words: "450 surveys were distributed between June and October, 2016" "Although semantic differential scales are often used for ease, there is no specified scale for TPB." This sentence makes no sense as one does not represent a theory using a scale. I assume that you meant to write ... there is no specified scale for attitudes or ambivalence... Not sure what you mean actually. Please clarify.

Please justify development of the ellipse drawing to capture uncertainty. What is the problem with asking participants to rate their confidence in their answer or their certainty about their answer on a rating scale? It's unclear why this was done. and given the subjective nature of interpretation, how it is better than a rating scale.

Please delete references to future work as they do not contribute to this manuscript: Delete reference to fuzzy sets and future publication and delete reference to interviews and data to be published elsewhere. This data is included in this paper.

At end of Methods:
"The nature and direction of relationships between variables explored will be described in Results, referencing illustrative figures of significant results for attitudes examined." Delete this sentence. You need not tell your reader what comes next so explicitly.

Discussion:

Others have explored participants' desire to share results with relatives, however most have been in the context of research… NEEDS CITATIONS

We used quantitative methods to explore participants' intentions to share their genomic results with parents and siblings and their desire to receive relatives' WGS results. DELETE--we already know what methods were used.

Generally too much reiteration of results. This is where you interpret what they mean going forward. Delete the results. If you need to anchor us, use a short intro sentence to remind the reader of the findings you aim to discuss.

Consider writing about What happens now? What do these data anticipate? what should be put in place to help others learn the importance of sharing results? What research questions follow on this research? The discussion is a letdown after reading the whole complex study and analysis. Make the meaning of your results known to your reader.
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