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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract
1. Conclusion: are not formulated well. The first part actually belongs to the Results section.

Background
2. Page 4, paragraph 2: this paragraph should be included at the beginning of the background as it explains the meaning of cancer prevention.

3. I suggest to remove the subtitle Cancer Awareness among the General Public and incorporate the text on this paragraph to the remaining text. The Background should focus on the role of GPs in cancer prevention so it is not necessary to dedicate the whole paragraph to cancer awareness among general population issues.

Methods
4. Participants: a reference about the data on GPs' number in Ireland is missing.
5. Participants: you stated that the sample was representative. I think you have to discuss its representativeness in the Discussion section.
6. Data collection: the questionnaire used is very poorly described. I suggest to describe it in more details (for example, some questions could be answered on the Likert scale but this was not mentioned in the Methods) or add it as a supplement file.

7. Data collection: very little is written about the qualitative part of the study: who did the interviews, based on what criteria you selected the participants etc.

Results
8. In general, this section is not well presented which is also a consequence of a poor description of the questionnaire. Also, some parts of the Results should be moved to the Methods (i.e. page 9: In Stage two the respondents were asked to identify areas for further development of their cancer prevention role).

9. The Provision of Cancer Avoidance Services paragraph: there are no data reported on this. Also, it is unclear whether these statements were gathered by the questionnaire or by the interviews.
10. Since you used a 5-point Likert scale in the questionnaire, why not calculate
the mean score of these scales? Then, you could also perform the univariate analysis to detect possible differences between GPs.

Discussion

11. At the beginning of discussion, you should state the most important findings of your study. They should be in concordance with the aim of the study.

12. You should address the limitations of your study, especially the methodological ones.

Conclusion

13. Some conclusions are not based in the results of the study, i.e. GPs perceived nurses to be better placed to have a cancer prevention role with patients as their relationship with patients provides the potential to address broader issues such as behaviour and lifestyle change as well as new models of illness and wellness care concurrently.

Minor Essential Revisions

Background

1. You should explain the abbreviations when they emerge in text for the first time (GP).

2. The aim of the study should be moved to the end of the Background.

Methods

3. Participants: the data on response rate should be moved to the beginning of the Results.

Results

4. Figure 1: the figures tend to be unclear. I suggest to present these data in table with absolute numbers and percentages. Also, was this question an open question or were the possible answers listed? This comment also refers to the above comment about the poor description of the questionnaire.

5. Do not begin sentences with numbers.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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