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Reviewer's report:

General
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   - Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
   The research question[s] are not explicitly stated and inclusion of these details, linked to the purpose of the article would strengthen the readability and focus.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   - Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
   The qualitative methods are a little thin in detail. However, this might be related to the preferences of the journal rather than any author related issues. The authors might like to consider if an interpretive descriptive approach would best detail how they conducted the analysis?

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
The data collection, analyses and inclusion of participant quotes in the article are appropriate for qualitative methods.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   - Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
   The authors might like to consider further development of their commentaries around the participant quotes that are provided.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   XXXXX Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
   This is the weakest section of the paper. I suggest that the authors re-visit this to more explicitly convey the implications of the findings. I wondered about the possibility of discussing the following; The emergence of active surveillance, and what that might mean for GPs. The current understandings about PSA velocity guiding the need for TRUS-Bx and Tx[s]. The impact of not having a PSA policy - e.g. does this jeopardize the uptake of your guidelines? Moreover, does it leave GPs between a rock and a hard place? Will PSA screening change with the RCT results due out in 2008?

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
I suggest another draft to do justice to this important study - and eradicate some of the moments that border on prolix.

These are not major revisions per se. However, I strongly encourage the authors to re-visit from an editorial perspective to further advance the readability, and re-write the conclusion to provide a more sophisticated outline of the implications of the study findings.
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