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Reviewer's report:

This is a good article that makes an important contribution to the specialty of pancreatic cancer screening.

Comments:

On page 4 line 24 you state only 4 studies have so far analyzed the psychological effects of PDAC screening. Please could you address in the methods how this was determined (systematic review, search terms?)

In line 29 you state PDAC screening differs greatly from other cancer screening programs given poor prognosis, lack of reliable screening and relatively high morbidity of surgery. This differs from many screening programs but something like ovarian cancer screening would have the same first two issues. I think the second sentence in this paragraph has a typo ('outmost' should be 'utmost', line 34). Also, it doesn't directly seem to follow on from your first sentence, so perhaps adding one more explanatory sentence would be helpful in this paragraph.

On page 7 line 41 you refer to a questionnaire and quote two papers (number 29 and 38). Please could you explain how the questionnaire was taken from these papers/adapted. Has it been validated?

On page 13 line 20 you refer to the level of cancer worries being acceptable. Could you clarify what threshold/benchmark is used to determine acceptability?

On page 14 line 5 there is an inconsistent use of referencing (numbered elsewhere but here refers to name, journal and date).

In line 7 you refer to fear of examination not being a major reason, but almost a quarter (21%) of participants who discontinued screening gave this as a reason. It seems this was an issue for a reasonable number in this group, so might be worth thinking about a little further for future education/support of potential participants in this area.
On page 15, line 11 you refer to cancer worries and psychological stress being 'acceptable'. Could you comment on the benchmark for being considered acceptable?

On page 16, line 40 there is a typo ('writing oft he manuscript').

References: 7 and 13 have 4 named authors whereas elsewhere you have limited to 3 names and then et al.

Again, this is very important work that will be helpful for families with increased risk of pancreatic cancer.
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