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Reviewer's report:

The paper offers a description of how stakeholders view the challenges involved in implementing a population-based screening programme for colorectal cancer. Although potentially interesting, the paper is a little hard to follow at the moment and some suggestions for improvement are given below.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

The authors state in the discussion that the focus of their study was on the effects of a “quality improvement program” but this isn’t mentioned in the title of the paper or the abstract.

More information needs to be provided in the introduction about when the programme was set up, how it works, how long it had been running at the time of the research, what screening options were available to people at different time points - so, the authors mention that screening using colonoscopy was available during particular initiatives, but it’s not clear whether it was available at other times. It’s also not clear what the role of the primary care physician is in the screening program and how this may have changed over time. The authors mention ‘in-reach’ and ‘out-reach’ but it’s not clear how screening is organised and the relationship between these two methods of approach – this is obviously relevant to the issue of screening duplication. It’s also not clear what happens when people self-refer (an option mentioned in the discussion).

I think it would help a great deal if the authors had an additional Figure which shows how their study maps onto the PRISM model. A lot of different terms are used and it’s not always easy to follow who’s who. So for example in the results section the authors talk about ‘key leaders’, ‘managers’, ‘implementation groups’ and it’s not clear which categories the people who took part in this study sit in.

I think the paper would also be improved by re-organising the results, so that they also map onto the PRISM model e.g. putting issues to do with ‘infrastructure’ together, and identifying where the different stakeholders sit in the model and the specific concerns that they raised. This would also help organise the discussion section bit more.

The tables mentioned in the text had not been uploaded.
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