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General comment

This is a very interesting and well written paper timely exploring a hot topic for public health and family practice. In this field we really need qualitative research. Unfortunately I am not an expert of qualitative research methodology.

Specific comments
Abstract

Introduction

I suggest to move the first sentence about the sociological perception of cancer after an objective quantification of the cancer burden and of PCa burden. Furthermore it could be better distinguished the interpretation by health sociologists and the messages in the society.

Methods

I am not an expert in qualitative methods, but some authors questioned the use of reporting sentences as main findings. I appreciated your paper and the results are easy to read, but may be you should justify your methodological choice.

Results

See methods

Discussion

The discussion is well written. I think there are a couple of issues emerging in the interviews that are not discussed at all: 1) it is clear that some of the men do not want to make an informed
choice, but they want that the practitioner informs and decide what it is better for them; this is a big issue because it makes even more difficult the job of the practitioner including to recognize people that want to make their own choice and those who do not. If we do not recognize this point clearly emerging from several studies like this one, the informed choice ethical imperative risks to be only a rhetoric issue. 2) It is interesting that many men perceive screening PSA screening as a gender equity issue, not considering the efficacy and impact on health as a relevant issue in prioritizing public health intervention. 3) finally, it seems that the vast majority of the interviewed people had a quite good understanding of the concept of over-diagnosis, this is very surprising, I think they gave better answers than a random samples of physicians would do! Nevertheless, over-diagnosis is not perceived as so detrimental harm (this is consistent with the results of some studies on the value given by women in breast cancer over-diagnosis, sorry in this moment I cannot find the correct references).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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