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Reviewer's report:

I thought this paper was much improved as a result of the revisions. I have just a few comments on this version:

1) The questionnaire (in the appendix) and the Abstract refer to ‘active or passive smoking’ as a single item, but separate results are given for active (90.8%) and passive (86.3%) smoking knowledge in the Results section. How is this possible?

2) The question does not give people the option of saying that a factor is neither risky nor protective – I think this is a limitation which should be mentioned in the Discussion. It is likely to have increased the rate of guessing.

3) I am concerned by the authors’ responses to my previous point 4 about the selection of risk/protective factors included. They use the word ‘attitudes’ and I interpret their response to mean that they were, to some extent, measuring common beliefs about the protection or risk conferred by these factors. If this is the case, then it is inappropriate to combine all the items in a single scale and call it knowledge.

4) There are still a great many minor mistakes in the manuscript. The authors say the manuscript has been checked by a native speakers, but I it has not been done well enough. Here are the errors I noticed in the Abstract alone:
   a. Title - ‘in Moroccan population’ should be changed to ‘in the Moroccan population’ or ‘in a Moroccan population sample’
   b. Abstract objective – should be ‘awareness of cancer’ not ‘awareness on cancer’
   c. Abstract objective – should be ‘among the Moroccan general population’
   d. Abstract methods – should read ‘sample of the Moroccan adult population’
   e. Abstract methods – ‘fruits’ should be ‘fruit’; ‘feeding maternal’ should be ‘breast-feeding’
   f. Abstract methods – ‘protector factor’ should be ‘protective factor’
   g. Abstract methods – ‘summing correct answer’ should be ‘summing the correct answer’
   h. Abstract methods – ‘0 if the answer was false or subject don’t know’ should be ‘0 if the answer was incorrect or the participant responded ‘don’t know’
   i. Abstract results – ‘from rural area’ should be ‘from a rural area’
j. Abstract results – ‘higher in urban area’ should be ‘higher in urban areas’

I’m afraid I don’t have time to provide editing input to the rest of the manuscript, but I would urge the authors to have a native English speaker edit it for them again. In the tables ‘femelle’ should be ‘female’ and the French ‘2,000 à 4,999’ should be replaced by ‘2,000 to 4,999’.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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