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Reviewer's report:

General

The manuscript has improved after being revised. However, there still are some issues that would benefit from further modification.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

The presentation of the results from the logistic regression analysis has been changed in the revised version but is still not correct. It is imperative to present the results in a clear and correct manner in order not to mislead the readers. The reviewer therefore insists that the authors clearly state the outcome of the logistic regression analysis. Are the authors estimating the odds ratio of having insufficient knowledge of breast cancer or having sufficient knowledge of the disease? This must be written in a way that leaves the readers without doubt. The outcome should be stated both in the text, whenever relevant, and in table 2. The interpretation of an odds ratio is given in most epidemiological text books. Please check if uncertain. You may also check with the comments in the previous review report. An example of misinterpretation of the OR in the manuscript: On page 10 it reads “… the level of insufficient knowledge… was 2.2 times higher”. It is not the level of insufficient knowledge that is 2.2 higher in expanded families than in core families; it is the odds of having insufficient that is 2.2 higher (given that insufficient knowledge is the outcome and not sufficient knowledge).

If, after all, the authors do not feel confident if performing, interpreting and presenting logistic regression analysis, the reviewer think it would be better omit these analyse from the paper rather than presenting unclear results.

As suggested in the first review report, an overall table on knowledge of breast cancer, CHBMS score, BSE and mammography practice would be increase the accessibility of the paper.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Be consequent in using the abbreviations CHBMS or HBM throughout the manuscript.

Abstract, Result section: suggest including “socio-demographic” (…variables..) in the sentence starting with “Level of ..”, and including “according to scores of CHBMS.” in the last sentence, for distinction.

Background pg. 4: The sentence starting with “Although ACS no longer recommends…” is not easily understood (especially the first part of it) and should be rewritten. Also the word “early” or the like seems to be missing.

Methods pg. 6: The sentence starting with “The aim of the study…” talks about a 99.9 confidence interval, no interval is given. Please clarify.
Methods pg. 7: It is described that data were collected from those who gave verbally consent. How many women were asked to participate altogether, how many said “Yes” and how many said “No”? How could the participant rate surpass 100%? Where women who refused to join the study replaced by others?
Methods pg. 9: The sentence starting with “Attitudes of the husbands…”, is this statement based on findings in the present study? If not, please include a reference.
Results pg. 10: suggest including “CHBMS” (… subscale…) in the sentence starting with “Table 3 presents…” for clarity.
Discussion pg. 11: The figures in table 4 does not support the statement saying that that older women where more likely to perform BSE than younger women. Also, as the authors say, there is no overall statistical significant association between age and BSE.
Discussion pg. 11: Are the figures 27.9% and 5.1% concerning mammography presented in the result section? If not, please include.
Discussion pg. 12: Please include a reference to the first sentence on the page.
Discussion pg 13: The sentence starting with “In this study, seriousness was…” merely repeats the preceding sentence and could be deleted. You may move the fragment “In this study,” to the beginning of the preceding sentence.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
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
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