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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for your article: "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".

It was easy to read and clear. This is a subject of interest for French GPs and the organization of health in the territory.

Here are some suggestions for corrections:

Summary :
- In the results, specify the number of people in the sample (1063 MG surveyed, including 369 spontaneously stating that they do not use smears)
- In the results, review the wording with the ORs

Introduction :
- Line 8-9: I am surprised, because in practice there are also smears performed by midwives and (more rarely) in analytical laboratories... This result should be updated or at least stated that it dates back to 2005 and that the outpatient midwifery offer has since developed. We will come back to this in the discussion.
- Line 26: Be careful, the bibliography has been inserted in another format here.
Methods

- In Figure 1, the number of employees needs to be better defined, because it can be assumed that it is 34.7% of 68.6%.

- More generally, I think it is necessary to specify for the 2009 barometer. According to their publication (http://inpes.santepubliquefrance.fr/CFESBases/catalogue/pdf/1343.pdf), there were 2083 answers (57.1% in a sample from the Cegedim database). I can't find this notion of 1063 answers; what selection was applied?

- Are the survey respondents AND the survey respondents selected by the study representative? (It would at least be worth mentioning as a limit under discussion).

Results

- Line 36: GPs and not GPS (even if doctors know the surrounding cities well from their visits)

- Table 2: It is interesting to note (and discuss) that patients against HPV vaccination are also not prone to smears... Have you characterized these anti-vaccines as non-swabbing? Is there a correlation with CAM practice, for example?

- Table 3: If the maximum time to reach a general practitioner is 3.8 minutes, there is a probable selection bias, as mentioned above... (which is not surprising: the questionnaire lasts 30 minutes, doctors practising in "very rural" settings are certainly among the 31% who refuse to participate in the survey).

Discussion

- With a low estimate (there are probably some GPs who do not smear among those who say the patient would be embarrassed, or that they have not thought about it), we are at 369 GPs who do not smear out of 1063 GPs interviewed, or 35%. In a study we conducted in Flanders (and which you mentioned: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5723048/), 53% of GPs practising smears in declarative mode (although this is a disadvantaged population, which according to your results is a factor associated with a lower smear rate). This point is already well discussed; nevertheless, you say that the rate is "consistent" but I think that this is not the case between 35% and 53%: you most probably underestimated this rate by the methodology
used (this is not a negative criticism, I think you did the right thing, but in my opinion we must assume the underestimation more here).

- In my opinion, two important points are missing in the involvement for practice. The first is that the use of smears by GPs does not ensure a much higher screening rate for women - which is what we are looking for! (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29583084); the second is that the development of the ambulatory midwifery offer AND the organized smear screening announced by Agnes Buzyn should be part of the equation.

I would like to reiterate my thanks for having me read this work, and wish you good luck for the publication.
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