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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

thank you for the relevant and interesting paper on development of the new satisfaction with colposcopy instrument for women - patients. I find the logic of the paper good enough, still there are some questions:

1. How large is the difference in the number of colposcopy referrals? (sentence 1 of Introduction section)

2. On my opinion, the major weakness of the paper - it does not present the background of women's experience, attitude and satisfaction with colposcopy as well as its measurement, including the details of the colposcopy procedure in the Netherlands (is it GP's area of competence?). Without this information, the contribution of this paper to the knowledge is not clear. Aslo, the paper operates with several concepts, e.g. satisfaction, attitude, experience, self-rating. So, in the end, what does the instrument measure?

3. The procedure of the questionnaire development is not always clear: e.g. you mention that "open interview strategy" has been applied and then "fifteen questionnaire items remained". How many items have been developed in the beginning? Who developed them? based on what strategy?
4. The content-wise description of the questions is presented in Discussion, however the instrument development is the core aim of this paper and it should be well-described before discussing the key findings. For example, on the first page of Results you refer to "patient's perception of procedure" and "patient's perception of the communication" however the reader does not understand what it means and how it is operationalized. Have there been other dimension that have not been included in the instrument but have been considered as important or relevant?

5. You state that you have invited 74 persons to be respondents at your study and you use "the first draft questionnaire". I wonder whether you later use "second" or "final" draft of the questionnaire? With how many participants? And what does "first draft" mean here?

6. Why PHQ-4 has been used instead of other questionnaires that were mentioned in the beginning of the paper, e.g. QUOTE, CAHPS.

7. Do the results of your study consistent with other studies? What have been innovative - in terms of research development - in your study? its results? What are the potential factors that could influence the results (e.g. if this instrument is used in Groningen, would you expect the same results?) In general, the Discussion section is lacking references.

8. The conclusions (wider implications of the paper and importance for decision-making and policy-making) are missing
Other minor comments:

1. I am lacking page numbers therefore referral to certain text experts has been problematic.

2. Line 15 - 16, Introduction 1st page: The reference and explanation is lacking to the "this procedure is associated with dissatisfaction in patients"

3. The Number of the Tables does not seem to match the text references. It is important to indicate the location of the table in the text. (for example, there are two tables "1")

4. Line 43, first page of Results: "084" - perhaps, the point is missing?

5. Web-page links should be formatted appropriately.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
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