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The Editor
BMC Health Services Research

Dear Editor

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript titled “Screening Mammography Beliefs and Recommendations: A Web-based Survey of Primary Care Physicians”. We have addressed reviewer's comments and revised the manuscript.

Response to Reviewer's report

Title: Screening Mammography Beliefs and Recommendations: A Web-based Survey of Primary Care Physicians
Version: 7 Date: 27 December 2011
Reviewer: Mariona Pons-Vigués
Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions:

This paper aims to explored primary health physicians beliefs and recommendations for screening mammography for average risk women in various age categories, the influence of USPSTF guidelines on their clinical practice and their hypothetical decisions for mammography in specific clinical scenarios. The manuscript has been revised and most of the reviewer's concerns have been addressed. However, my new comments are below:
Comments
(1) - It is recommended to specify the setting and the year of the study in the objective in the abstract
Response
Please see the revised text in the abstract:
This study explored primary care physicians’ (PCPs) perceptions of the influence of clinical practice guidelines for SM; the recommendations for SM in response to the hypothetical case scenarios; and the factors associated with perceived SM effectiveness and recommendations in the US from June to December 2009 before recently revised United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) guidelines.

(2) - It is strange to see a reference in the abstract
Response
This was a typo, my apologies. Reference [1] deleted.

(3) - The first time, it is necessary to explain the meaning of USPSTF (page 3)
Response
Please see the revised text on page # 3 and line # 7.
The United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF).

(4) - Page 4: Why physicians over 75 years were excluded?
Response
The reasons for exclusion were (1) Our study sample included technically literate primary care physicians sampling frame, (2) the database had access to a very small number of primary care physicians over 75 years, with active licensure.

(5) - Page 6: Of those (40.3%) 48378 were family physicians, (43.6%) 52199 general internists, and (16%) 19170 obstetricians/gynecologists. This 3 percentages don’t add 100
Response
I have revised the numbers with correct percentages (page # 6 line # 13-15).
A total of 261721 PCPs were identified in the database and email addresses were available for (44.7%) 119747. Of those (40.4%) 48378 were family physicians, (43.6%) 52199 general internists, and (16%) 19170 obstetricians/gynecologists.

(6) - A flow chart might be helpful for understand the sampling plan
Response
Although I have made a flow chart but I did not include it in the manuscript because of the lack of information on (1) number of no responses (2) returned to
sender directly (3) not able to participate (4) eligible to participate and (5) non response by gender distribution.

(7) - Change “Bivaraite” to “Bivariate” (pages 7 and 10)
Response
Spellings corrected on page # 7 and line # 17 and page # 10 and line # 21.

(8) - Page 14: "However, the absence of any differences between early and late respondents on the questions related to perceived effectiveness and mammography recommendations suggests that nonresponse did not substantively bias our key findings”. This sentence is a little bit daring
Response
I have modified this sentence on page # 14 and line # 20-22. This sentence now reads as..
"However, the absence of any differences between early and late respondents on questions related to perceived effectiveness and mammography recommendations suggests that nonresponse is less likely to bias our key findings.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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