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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript should be revised in total - therefore major compulsory revisions. This is such important work and I want to congratulate the authors with the work they have done. Unfortunately the manuscript is complex and I had difficulty in understanding what it was all about as the study does not focus on its aims and no results are presented. I understand that this is a second paper which is part of a much larger study but as it is written now, it cannot stand on its own. It is also not clear what is part of the trial and sub-trial.

The abstract does not speak of the aims of the study there is also no summary of the findings.

There are parts in the introduction section that is not clear and need to be rephrased specifically lines 51 to 60. It is also better not to use acronyms like ect and e.g. but to rather be specific. Please also make sure that you refer to health care services as services can be anything. There are also other acronyms in the manuscript that would not be known to readers and not first written out and then abbreviated.

The aims and objectives are to:

1. Demonstrate the intervention package is effective in leveraging cancer screening uptake
   • This aim is clear however, there are no results to support that the intervention package was indeed effective
2. Demonstrate that high risk individuals in the intervention arm will compared to those in the delayed intervention condition show increased use of screening service and improved KAP in relation to the service
   • It is not clear what it meant with the delayed intervention condition as only a control group is mentioned (page 11)
   • Is it not a given that if you are not part of the intervention you would not know about the services – thus what is meant with “in relation to the service” is not clear
   • Similarly there are no results to substantiate what is said to be demonstrated
3. Establish a sustainable mechanism in which village doctors maintain continuous momentum integrating cancer screening promotion with routine medical services ever since initiation of this project in rural China
• Once again there are no results to show whether you were successful or not.

A very interesting theoretical framework has been developed – however, I am not sure that the details fit it in this manuscript as according to the aims of the study, it is not the focus.

The intervention is described in detail.

Because there are no results the discussion does not focus what was found but is rather a general discussion of the study which also includes statements made in the introduction. The limitations are not in line with the study aims.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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