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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-articulated qualitative study exploring the reasons why physicians in Hong Kong have a low participation rate in the government run screening programme for cervical screening. The methodology used is appropriate and the findings are relevant in the wider context of public health screening programmes though some caution should be expressed regarding the generalizability of such a study, given that these are based on the views of only 16 individuals. There are some contextual and methodological aspects which require some clarification.

Major Compulsory Revisions: None

Minor Essential Revisions:

Methodology

1. Study participants – what was the sampling frame from which the purposive sample was drawn (e.g HKAM mailing list? MCHK register?) and what were the inclusion/exclusion criteria for participants?

2. How was it determined that 16 participants were sufficient for the study? Were interviews conducted until there was saturation of themes?

3. What was the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee and any potential bias? Were there any language issues which might affect the acquisition or interpretation of the interview data?

4. Data analysis – What is Rogers theoretical framework and why was it selected to be used to formulate the conceptual structure?

Results

5. What is the difference between “General Practice” and “Family Practice”? Some explanation of the nature of primary care in Hong Kong would be helpful for readers unfamiliar with the HK setting.

Conclusions

6. There is a conclusion drawn regarding private physicians yet 5/16 of the participants were based in public (government/NGO) settings – any comment or conclusion regarding this portion of the study population?
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