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Response to the comments of Reviewer 1

Major Compulsory Revisions:

Comment: The title, the aims, and the body of the paper do not correspond well. The aims of the study should be clarified both in the abstract and in the introduction.

Response: The title of the study is changed as: ‘The knowledge and attitudes about breast self-examination and mammography of women in a rural area of western region in Turkey’. The aims of the study are clarified both in the abstract and in the introduction.

Comments: Background Pg.3, line 1-3: The reviewer disagrees with the statement that breast cancer has a higher death rate than other cancers. Pg.3 line 9-12: The sentence reads ‘increase breast cancer risk…’ but this is not the case for all the factors listed (e.g. physical activity).

Methods: Pg. 6 ‘Sample’ Please provide more information on how sampling was done (cluster unit, response rate, ect.) . Was the study approved by an ethical committee?

Responses: The statement that the reviewer disagrees in the line 1-3, is deleted. The risks of breast cancer are corrected and indicated statement is made more specific. Methods: Pg.6 sampling method was written in detail. The statement ‘the study was approved by the city health administration’ is added in the methods section.
Comments: Results Pg.8 the section about logistic regression needs to be re-written and interpreted correctly. Information about logistic regression model could also gainfully be given in the Method section.

Responses: The section about logistic regression is re-written and by changing the breast cancer in family/friends category, analysis is repeated. Information about logistic regression model is given in the Method section.

Comments: Discussion: Pg. 10, paragraph on logistic regression (and Pg.11 last sentence) has to be rewritten. Pg. 11 ‘On the other hand….’ The meaning of the sentence is unclear.

Responses: The statements about logistic regression are rewritten. On Pg.11 the indicated sentence is clarified as: ‘Since, independent variables like education level, women’s job status, income level and type of health insurance are similar among the women of this study, they may not be significant in BSE practice as well as mammography.’

Comment: The conclusion should be shortened and more focused.

Response: The conclusion section is made more focused and shortened.

Minor Essential Revisions

Comments: Abstract: in the method section, information on which statistical tests were used is more important than what computer program was used. Background: Pg.3, line 14-15: The sentences ‘Evidence has demonstrated…’ and ‘The primary….’ should be deleted. Pg.3 last sentence: If ‘screening’ referring to mammography screening, the sentence should go along with the mammography section on pg.4. Methods: Pg.7; section on CHBMS, include minimum and maximum value for the score. Discussion: Pg.10, line 3 and line 13: Are the findings ‘29.5% performing BSE from time to time’ and ‘56.1% had sufficient knowledge of breast cancer’ given the results section? Pg.12 line 5 from the bottom: ‘One research group found..’ and ‘In a study of Mexican…’ please include the references for the studies.

Responses: Abstract, in the method section: information about statistical tests are added. Background: Pg.3, line 14-15: these two sentences are deleted. Pg.3 last sentence: ‘screening’ is not referring to mammography. Method: minimum and maximum values for the score are included. And the other comments about tables are corrected. Discussion: These two sentences are presented as recommendation. Pg.12 line 5 from the bottom: references are included for the studies.

In general, grammatical errors are corrected.
Response to the comments of Reviewer 2

Minor Essential Revisions

**Comment 1:** The authors noted that the single biggest predictor of breast cancer risk is increasing age. This being the case, they need to explain in the Methods section why they only included women younger than 65 years of age.

**Response 1:** Explanation of Comment 1 in the Methods section is written as. ‘Although advanced age is a risk factor in breast cancer, women over 65 were not taken in this study, because there is a considerable risk of inadequate perception’.

**Comments 2 and 3:** Suggest that the authors review the ACS’s website for how it describes the factors that increase and decrease risk status. Although ACS no longer recommends BSE, the Reviewer gives some suggestions for using BSE in the study.

**Responses 2 and 3:** The risks of breast cancer are corrected and clarified regarding to Reviewer’s suggestion in the introduction section: ‘Other factors that increase breast cancer risk include a long menstrual history (menstrual periods that started early and/or ended late in life), obesity after menopause, recent use of oral contraceptives, postmenopausal hormone therapy, never having children or having one’s first child after age 30, ethnicity characteristics, exposure to radiation, or consumption of one or more alcoholic beverages per day (2, 3). High breast tissue density (which is a mammographic measure of the amount of glandular breast tissue relative to fatty tissue in the breast) reduces the breast cancer detection rates for clinical breast exam (CBE) and mammogram. Breastfeeding, moderate or vigorous physical activity, and maintaining a healthy body weight are all associated with lower risk of breast cancer (2).’ Reviewer’s suggestion about BSE is added in the introduction section.

**Comments 4 and 5:** Pg.4 the first and second full paragraph: clarify where the women live for whom these screening rates are being reported in the Zincir and Secginli studies. In that same second paragraph on pg.4, the opening sentence could be modified.

**Responses 4 and 5:** It is clarified where these two studies were performed. Pg.4, the opening sentence is modified: ‘Annual mammography is considered the most valuable tool for detecting breast cancer in the earliest possible stages, before the cancer has metastasized and when interventions are most effective and least invasive and debilitating’.

**Comment 6:** Pg.6 in the Methods section, name the IRB that approved this study.

**Response 6:** It is added that ‘The study was approved by the city health administration.’ in the methods section.
Comments 7 and 8: Pg.8 Results section, under results or as the last section of the Methods section, insert a new section called, Description of the sample, and give some additional information about Turkish women and their culture.

Responses 7 and 8: ‘Description of the sample’ section is added on Pg.8-9.

Comment 9 and 10: Discussion section: spends considerable time discussing BSE, but barely addresses mammography. You noted in the Results section that health professionals were mentioned as a source of breast cancer information by less than a quarter of the sample. What conclusions might you reach about that statistic?

Responses 9 and 10: Information sources of breast cancer are discussed as recommendation. Some details about mammography data are included in the discussion section.

In general, grammatical errors are corrected.