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Reviewer's report:

General

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Manuscript Title: Mammography Screening: Views from Women and Primary Care Physicians in Crete

The study focuses on an important topic: Perceptions of mammography screening among women and primary care physicians in Crete, Greece. The authors effectively note differences between screening in Greece and in other countries, stating that Greece has no “nationally formulated strategy” for mammography and breast cancer early detection. The study results will have significant impact on the development of national policy.

The manuscript lacks a description of how the sociodemographic characteristics of the study participants might have influenced their responses to the study questions. Similarly, for the physicians in the study, it is not clear how their age or years spent working as physicians might have influenced their responses.

The manuscript lacks a clearly described conceptual framework. As a result, the basis or underlying rationale for the development of the questions asked during the individual interviews is difficult to understand. The inclusion of a conceptual framework would also aid in the interpretation of study data. For example, the rationale by which themes were selected for the data coding process is a bit unclear. An expanded conceptual framework could include participants’ spiritual beliefs, as reported by the authors, such as a participant’s statement that “God has appointed doctors to save and help people”.

The inclusion of a conceptual framework could also help the interpretation of the comments made by the female participants vis a vis the comments made by the physicians in the study.

The lack of a clearly described conceptual framework makes it difficult to interpret the study results in a cohesive manner.
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

On p. 3 of the manuscript, the authors appear to confuse diagnostic mammography with screening mammography when they state “Physicians are able to request mammography for a woman when there is a suspicion of a breast problem or when the woman asks the physicians for mammography screening”.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**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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