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Reviewer's report:

Rose et al., have submitted a paper on the development of a survey instrument to investigate the primary care factors related to differences in cancer diagnosis between six countries with primary care led health services. In general, authors have clearly defined the question and adequately described the methods. The manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition. Discussion is well balanced and adequately supported by the data. Limitations of the work are clearly stated. Authors have acknowledged previous work on the subject. The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found. The writing is acceptable.

However, the authors may also clarify the following:

Major compulsory revisions

1) Conceptualization: How many participants were included in the primary care practitioners’ group? Was there any specific process followed to generate the set of hypotheses for testing, i.e., nominal group technique?
2) Choice of data collection method: How will the instrument be administered?
3) Operationalization and development of survey: How many participants were included in each jurisdiction? Was there any specific process followed to generate questionnaire items (vignettes, direct questions), i.e., Delphi process? What was the response format of the second part of the survey?
4) Validation: How many participants were included in each jurisdiction?
5) Testing consistency: Was interrater reliability assessed? For internal consistency was a statistical test performed? If yes, please provide the results.
6) Pilot testing of the final version: How many items did the final questionnaire include? Was there a factor analysis performed? If yes, what were the results?
7) Practical survey method: What was the sample selection method? How was the decision on choosing two out of the five vignettes was made?
8) Analysis plan: Was a power calculation performed for the main outcome?
9) Discussion: The authors may discuss more on the reasons that restricted pilot testing only to 16 PCPs in the UK without considering other jurisdictions. In addition, they may also discuss on how the restriction to two out of the 5 vignettes might influence the validity of the results on the actual survey.
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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