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Reviewer's report:

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 quantitative assessment of these differences is appropriate, but a qualitative approach also will be interesting. My concerns are mostly related to the description of your methods, your sample, and length of results/discussion section. My specific major comments are below:

-It is necessary to describe the setting: place and year of the study. This information should appear in the abstract, in the objective and in the methods section

-The abstract of the manuscript should not exceed 350 words

-Background section
It is necessary to review the issue deeper and put more references in the manuscript. For example, there aren’t references supporting the third paragraph. It should be written from the standpoint of researchers without specialist knowledge in the screening area. Now, it is difficult to follow. For example, which is the periodicity of the mammography? Every year? Biannual?
The aim is hard to follow. It could be reworded and clarified (place, year, etc)
It would be interesting to justify the interest of the study

-Methods section
It should include the design of the study, the setting, the study population, etc before the sampling methodology. Please explain
Please describe study’s inclusion and exclusion criteria.
How was the questionnaire constructed?
How many questions had? It will be interesting to do a table with the different items. Explain why periodicity is not included in the study.
How was the survey validated?
Which are the dependent and independent variables?
The statistical section of the manuscript seems confusing. Please clarify this section and explain the handling of missing values.
-Results
Show all the data explained. For example, last sentence of the first section of the results section.

-Discussion
It should discuss the results with the existing literature
Which other limitations there are in this study?
Which are the strengths and the implications of the study?

-References
References should follow the BMC Health Services Research style
Some references don’t have year of publication

-Table 1
Include the missings because there are items that are incompletely. For example, had a mammogram in the family physicians don’t add up 110 females.
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