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Reviewer's report:

This study addresses an important topic, namely measuring informed choice about breast screening. The current paper builds on related work previously published by the authors which they cite appropriately for further information on certain aspects. The statistical methods are described quite extensively and seem reasonably clear, but unfortunately I do not feel I have the necessary expertise to really assess the appropriateness of the details of the statistical approaches described. With regard to other sections of the manuscript, I have outlined below a few relatively minor points that I think the authors should address to strengthen their paper.

1. In the opening paragraph, 'the harms' of screening are mentioned, including false positive results. Particularly for a psychology journal audience, I think it is important to briefly introduce the concept of overdiagnosis here because it will be completely new to many readers (as will the existence of controversy around breast screening) and this is critical to understanding the need for informed choice.

2. Page 2 line 33-34 "Being properly informed can reduce negative consequences." While I fully agree with the authors in terms of the importance of informed choice, do we really have evidence that being properly informed can reduce the negative consequences of screening? If not, it may be preferable to slightly soften this statement, for example replacing 'can' with 'could', 'may' or 'might'.

3. Page 3 line 39-40 "advocated by many organisations in the last years (e.g. the Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care, IQWiG)". For international readers, I think it would be worthwhile to (a) state explicitly that this is a German organisation / in Germany, and (b) provide a source for the fact that IQWiG advocates informed choice (even if this is just a website in German).

4. Page 3 lines 49-52. This sentence is a bit awkward and could be worded more clearly.

5. Page 4 line 83 "an informed choice constitutes a decision based on relevant knowledge, in consistence with individual values and leading to action". I believe this is indeed how
Marteau originally defined informed choice, but it is slightly different from the approach actually taken in this study (as explained in section 2.2) which does not assess the 'leading to action' aspect. Perhaps edit to make this clearer.

6. Page 5 line 122 "The German questionnaire was presented as additional file in a previous article". I am fortunate in that I have studied German to a level sufficient to read this document, but do the authors intend to publish an English translation too? This would be advantageous to maximise the future impact of their work among the global screening/research community.
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