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Fez, 15 July 2014

The Biomed Central Editorial Team

Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have reviewed the above manuscript according to your reviewer's comments.

Reviewer's report:

I'm afraid I still don't think the authors have adequately dealt with the concern that I raised last last, and so did Terry Slevin, that some of the factors included in the knowledge measure do not have proven links with cancer. It seems very unsatisfactory to have a sentence in the Discussion describing the calculated score as 'not very accurate' when another option (raised by the other reviewer) would be to remove the items about which there is more controversy.

I agree with the reviewer. We had rerun the analysis without confused items (food coloring and coffee) and considering only 12 items as recommended. New results are presented in this version.

In my last review, I suggested thinking of the findings as 'beliefs' rather than 'knowledge' and simply presenting the beliefs about each factor without having to classify them as 'correct' or 'incorrect', but the authors obviously don't think this is a good suggestion. Their response seems muddled, and implies that in some cases they are measuring 'knowledge' of widely held 'attitudes'.

We thank the reviewer for this pertinent remark. In this last version, the score knowledge was calculated basing only on the established risk or protective cancer factors (12 items excluding coffee and coloring food). In this case, we think that the use of "knowledge" is more appropriate. Coffee and coloring food were excluded because of their controversial association with cancer. So, we
used, in this version of the manuscript, the term of “belief” which is more appropriate; Please see the third paragraph of “Results” Chapter.

We had done all our best to answer the reviewer comments and we hope that the paper is suitable for publication.

Best regards,