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Reviewer's report:

General

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. The respondents seem to be rather young with few years in practice. This gives the impression of a biased sample. This should be acknowledged as a limitation of the study

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. In the introduction, 3rd paragraph, second sentence; the numbers to not make sense.
2. The diction throughout the document requires careful editorialization; eg, there is no word in the English language, "monitorization" (see introduction, 3rd paragraph). Also, in the abstract, the conclusion statement does not convey a clear message....."insufficient compatibility for true diagnoses"
3. The methods must be described more carefully. That is, the nature of the questions asked must be clearer so that the results can be followed more easily. As an example, the 3rd sentence of the first paragraph in this section lists what seem to be the focuses of questions contained within the questionnaire. However, how these questions are asked are pertinent to accurate interpretation of the results. By more clearly describing the questions asked, the reader can more easily understand what is meant when it is stated that the participants stated that they could not recognize disease. Does this mean the participant was actually asked if they could recognize disease or was this surmised based on their responses to certain questions?
4. The discussion is rambling and tangential. The focus should be on the shortcomings in the knowledge/training/practice patterns of primary care physicians in Turkey, in regards to Hepatitis C and B. There is too much recapitulation of the results. The message of the study is lost in this discussion; this section should be rewritten to focus on the major message
of the paper.

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
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