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Reviewer's report:

This is a review of Need for Information, Honesty and Respect: Patient Perspectives on Health Care Professionals Communication about Cancer and Fertility Reproductive Health. The authors may benefit from the following major and minor comments.

Major

* There are results in the methods section, for example, 56.7% had breast cancer etc. that whole paragraph with numbers goes in the results, not in the methods

* It is very odd that 78 interviews would have been done. Saturation would typically be reached way before 78, indicating that this was not done in a rigorous manner. This needs to be justified.

* Again, Final themes were… that needs to be in the results section not the analysis section

* Even if the names are made up, they need to be removed. It is more common to say Female Patient, Age 45. Not Abigail or Harry.

* The results section is too long.

* The discussion needs to tie this back to something actionable- what does this mean for policy or practice? This would help to justify why this needs to be published.

Minor

* Through the manuscript, especially in the introduction, there are run on sentences. Sentences longer than 30 words should be avoided.

* The paper talks about past research being limited by sample size, yet this study has over 800. There is a debate as to whether or not that is still small. I would temper the language and
present it as a more comprehensive study but it is not nationally representative or even the size of some other cancer studies like the CCCS.

* In the introduction the aim is in two paragraphs, it should only be in the later.
* Was there an incentive given?
* Why are some quotes in italics and some not?
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