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Reviewer’s report:

Title: The role of general practice in routes to diagnosis of lung cancer in Denmark: A population-based study of GP involvement, diagnostic activity and diagnostic intervals

Introduction:
This is an observational study which has aimed to describe diagnostic pathway and establish diagnostic intervals of lung cancer in Danish patients after the introduction of Danish national fast track cancer diagnostic pathway. This is an interesting study which might contribute towards improving the existing diagnostic systems and procedures.

The authors have clearly established the main aim of their study. However, the background is not coherent enough to justify the aim. Methodology and statistical analyses are well described.

Major Comments:

Data Collection: How was the questionnaire developed and what kind of information was collected from the GPs?

Descriptive data: Description of results is not clear - wide ranges of data were collected, as listed in Table 1. However, the description is very limited and does not explain all the data relating to various characteristics in the study. This needs to be done in a clear and concise manner to better highlight the outcome of this study.

Routes to diagnosis: In Figure 1, under GP not involved arm is three different ways of patient diagnosis, of which only two is explained in the text. Please explain what constitute the other ways of diagnosis.

Comparison with other studies: This section can be made brief and clearer by only highlighting the differences in comparison rather than explaining in detail about the other studies.

Reference list: A few of the listed references are not formatted and is not in line with the journal’s reference style.
Figure 1: Abbreviation ‘CAR’ is used for which I cannot find an explanation anywhere in the manuscript.
Figure 2: Label missing for the Y axis.
Figure 3: Colours used are not clear to differentiate between the groups.

Minor Comments:

There are a few grammatical errors which need to be corrected.
Were the non-responding GPs sent reminders?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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