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Reviewer’s report:

Major revisions

There is no information about the qualitative research methodology used for this study. This should be added. Was the thematic analysis conducted by two independent reviewers? Did they correspond? There is a need to provide sufficient detail to ensure that accepted qualitative research methodology standards are met.

There is a problem with the citation and use of reference number 17 which suggests the authors are not familiar with screening guidelines. There are no recommended screening options for ovarian cancer, very unlike colorectal cancer. This citation shows how physicians perform screening in the absence of recommendations, which is not correctly reflected in the document and suggests to the reader that the presented research is similar to the issues with ovarian cancer, when in fact they are the exact opposite (e.g. screening without guidelines vs not screening with guidelines.).

Please be sure to refer to Roger's DOI theory using the same language and cite this upon its first use in the methods.

Generalizability is a major limitation of this work and is not stated strongly enough. Qualitative work is never generalizable, it perhaps is hypothesis generating but no definitive statements can be made.

Minor revisions

The work is not fully placed in the context of work surrounding DOI and cervical cancer screening.

What is the rationale for selecting DOI as the framework for this study?
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Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
No conflicts of interest.