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Reviewer's report:

To the authors,

Thank you for your response to my comments. Please see below for my remaining comments.

Title:
You stated in your response to reviewers: "We agree it is likely not generalizable to the rest of MN or even outside our large region, but that's not the intent of the study." In this case, the title should be modified. As written, it implies your intent was to generalize to the region. Currently the title refers to understanding perceptions in "the Upper Midwest." This should be modified to specifically refer to understanding perceptions "in One Healthcare System in the Upper Midwest" or an alternative the authors prefer that can more precisely reflect the intent of the study.

Introduction
The majority of points were addressed except my question regarding cancer screening rates in your area. Intro p.3 line 35 "cancer screening rates are far from optimal" - this seems to be the primary impetus for your study. Please provide the following information: what is the rate of recommending appropriate screening in your system? What is the rate of patients actually receiving appropriate screening tests in your system? This is important background information for your study.

Methods/Results
No further comments

Discussion
Regarding your statement: "We agree it is likely not generalizable to the rest of MN or even outside our large region, but that's not the intent of the study." This lack of generalizability should be explicitly stated in the limitations of your study.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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