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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:

- It is recommended to specify the setting and the year of the study in the objective in the abstract
- It is strange to see a reference in the abstract
- The first time, It is necessary to explain the meaning of USPSTF (page 3)
- Page 4: Why physicians over 75 years were excluded?
- Page 6: Of those (40.3%) 48378 were family physicians, (43.6%) 52199 general internists, and (16%) 19170 obstetricians/gynaecologists. This 3 percentages don’t add 100
- A flow chart might be helpful for understand the sampling plan
- Change “Bivaraite” to “Bivariate” (pages 7 and 10)
- 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

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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