**Author’s response to reviews**

**Title:** General Practitioners who never perform Pap smear: the medical offer and the socio-economic context around their office could limit their involvement in cervical cancer screening

**Authors:**

Chiara Maj (kiaramara@live.fr)
Lorraine Poncet (lorraine.poncet@inserm.fr)
Henri Panjo (henri.panjo@inserm.fr)
Arnaud Gautier (Arnaud.GAUTIER@santepubliquefrance.fr)
Pierre Chauvin (pierre.chauvin@inserm.fr)
Gwenn Menvielle (gwen.menvielle@inserm.fr)
Emmanuelle Cadot (emmanuelle.cadot@ird.fr)
Virginie Ringa (virginie.ringa@inserm.fr)
laurent rigal (laurent.rigal@u-psud.fr)

**Version:** 3 **Date:** 30 Jul 2019

**Author’s response to reviews:**

Response to the reviewers – Point by point reply

**Editor Comments:**

1. Thank you for providing a statement regarding ethics and consent for your study. However, in the Ethics approval section of the Declarations, please include a reference to the relevant legislation. Please also state whether permission was required to access the data used in your study, along with the name of the body that granted you permission.

**Answer:**

The 2009 GP Health Barometer study, from which the data were derived for this current study, obtained all the necessary ethical regularly permissions. It was approved by the National Data Protection Authority (Commission nationale de l’informatique et des libertés), which is
responsible for the ethical issues and protection of individuals from illegal or inappropriate electronic data collection. This ethical approval was for the 2009 GP Health Barometer study and subsequent research using the same data. As this current study carried out secondary data analysis of the 2009 GP Health Barometer, it did not require direct ethical approval.

2. In accordance with our submission guidelines, please add the initials of all authors to the Authors’ contributions section, as well as their individual contributions.

Answer:

CM, VR and LR designed the study. AG participated to the data collection. CM and HP conducted the analyses. All authors (CM, LP, HP, AG, PC, GM, EC, VR, LR) discussed the results and their interpretation. CM, LP and LR drafted the manuscript. All authors (CM, LP, HP, AG, PC, GM, EC, VR, LR) critically revised the manuscript and approved the final version.

3. In your Funding section, please also state the role of the funding body in the design of the study; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; and in writing the manuscript.

Answer:

This project was funded by the French Research Institute in Public Health (IReSP). The funder had no role in the creation of the research question, design of the study, data collection, analysis, interpretation, or in the writing of this manuscript.

4. Please add an Acknowledgements section to your Declarations and please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the article who does not meet the criteria for authorship including anyone who provided professional writing services or materials. If you have no acknowledgements please put ‘Not Applicable’ in this section.

Answer:

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank all members of the French National Institute for Health Prevention and Education (INPES) members and all the participants who took part in the 2009 GP Health Barometer from where data for this current study was used.
5. Please provide a List of abbreviations after the Conclusions section. If abbreviations are used in the text, they should be defined in the text at first use and included in this list.

Answer:

cervical cancer screening (CCS), general practitioner (GPs)

6. As Boxes do not conform to our formatting guidelines, we ask that you please retitle Box 1 as either a Table or a Figure. Upon doing so, please update the references to it in the main text of the manuscript.

Answer:

We retitled the Box 1, Table 1

7. We noticed the phrase “women screening” was used in the Abstract and in the Discussion as well. We would suggest rewording this in the Abstract to “screening services for women”, “rates of screening for women”, or similar. In the Discussion, this can be changed to “rates of CCS” or similar.

Answer:

We changed for screening services for women and rates of CCS.

8. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colors. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Answer:

We did what you recommended.