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Reviewer's report:

The paper presents a very interesting analysis, to my knowledge innovative and the authors actually say something new on breast cancer screening and over diagnosis.

I think that such kind of analyses are useful, should not be limited to the editorials or other self-referential publications, but they does not fit in the standard format for research articles.

Major compulsory

Objective: the two questions do not help to understand what the authors are going to answer. Question 1) discuss with whom?

The second question seems less linked to framing and more with the knowledge about over diagnosis, except for value judgements.

Methods

Please describe the interview conduction: how was conducted the interview? Which questions? If there were no fixed questions please explain how the interviewers agreed to standardise the interview.

Results

The paragraph “how experts used frames” should give information in a more systematic way. May be a table with all the experts and the frames they use (may be in a qualitative way such as “+” “+/−” and “−”) and the expert’s role. I think this is very interesting.

Can you give an idea of any gender difference in the use of frames?

Discussion

In the discussion there is no mention of what are the strengths and limitations of this approach and of this study in particular. I mean how the results corroborate the method or not, which results are surprising or may give an idea of how much the controversy is bipolarised or is also interiorised by many experts.

I agree not to discuss how these results should suggest practice or other practical implications because this is just a tool to analyse the question and each actor should use it in a different way.
Minor essential
Results
Page 10: please explain with some notes what does it mean to be from East Sydney or North Sydney.
Was this point raised about stopping active invitations? Because active invitation has been shown to be effective in reducing inequalities.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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