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The question posed by this research is of interest, trying to reduce barriers to cancer screening among South Asian immigrants in Canada. However this paper needs to be much more focused and make better use of the data collected by their concept mapping.

The comments provided are considered necessary/major compulsory revisions.

Background, Paragraph 1: The authors should reduce the amount of information provided in this first paragraph since they need to primarily focus on the disparity issue on cancer screening between the overall population and the South Asian. The discussion of cancer screening as evidence based interventions (EBIs) and the recommendations for screening, do not seem necessary.

More important, the Background needs to demonstrate the differences between rates of screening for South Asian immigrants on the selected cancers to demonstrate the disparity. They have provided screening rates for the overall population but not the South Asians.

The focus on organizational factors and barriers is an interesting and important topic and they did focus on this on Page 5. However, they could indicate a bit more about how this information would be used and a bit less of telling about the gaps in the literature.

Methods, paragraph 1st sentence

The 1st sentence in Methods does not seem to belong and seems to just hang there.

They could include the goal in the Background.

Implementation Framework, Paragraph 1-2: This discussion of the implementation framework is very long and confusing. The authors introduce another concept of knowledge-to-action (KTA). They indicate that this is the framework that they are following but go on to say it is much more complex then what is in the framework. Not sure why this entire paragraph is included and the manuscript suffers since the authors are trying to do too much in this one manuscript. While, I do think that the use of a framework is valuable and important, its placement in this paper is confusing.
The authors should tell the reader about the concept mapping to identify barriers and organizational issues for implementation and then but this in the framework for the larger study. Discussing concept mapping, with all of its components, is a substantial undertaking but including all the phases and explanations of the multiple phase project, is distracting at best. Authors should think about dividing up this manuscript into a discussion of their framework and phases of their project and a separate paper on the concept mapping and what it found and how they used it.

In addition, the authors need to rewrite the manuscript and exclude the jargon. The writing is overly complex and includes phrases like “metaphorical funnel” and “permeable boundaries”, just to point a few examples, that are excessively descriptive language and not useful.

Study Setting, Paragraph 1: Again they provide way too much detail for the reader and need to focus on how they obtained their sample. This reads like a report narrative, not a summary in a research paper.

The Methods section should just focus on the methods for the concept mapping. The fact that they were following (not identified) standard Community-based Participatory Research methods- could be used to explain what they did to get stakeholders and the sample for the concept mapping.

Participants, Paragraph 1: Again the authors tell us more process. They should focus more on who the participants are, ethnicity, age, gender and number of participants. Some of this is in results and should be in Methods.

Results, Paragraph 1: Authors indicate they report the cluster statements but do not indicate where this is in the paper?

Cluster Description. It is typical to show the map that was produced and provide tables that list the clusters and even the statements. Since they had only 45 statements into 7 clusters, this would be a better way to display these data. As presented, they have dense paragraphs instead of some graphics. Also they have results and some discussion points mixed together in this section. There seems to be some good information, but the way it is provided, does not lend itself to easily being able to ascertain what was found. A better way to display the results is necessary for this manuscript. Not sure why the final map with the clusters is not included?

Cluster Ratings and Pattern Matching Paragraph 1- 2:

It is interesting that the authors are presenting cluster ratings by subgroup but question if the sample size is large enough for these differences to have any real meaning?

There is no explanation of pattern matching. This is also usually done in a graphic but the authors have not provided this. Not sure what the authors are trying to do with Table 2.
General comments
The authors have interesting information but the manuscript in its current form has not done a good job of describing why it was done, what was done, what was learned and how they are using this. The main problem is that they have included too many other things, since this is a multi-phase project so the results gained from concept mapping are not highlighted enough.

The paper has too many themes and does not provide enough detail and explanation of the main focus, the concept mapping. They have not provided the list of statements or the map to show the clusters. Focusing the paper and including the graphics for the concept mapping is necessary.

The writing needs to be improved since the paper uses many acronyms and the language includes a good amount of jargon.
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