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MS: 7717822463492844 Research article
Coverage of Jade Goody’s cervical cancer in UK newspapers: a missed opportunity for health promotion to the highest risk groups?

The manuscript is original and covers an interesting issue in public health, thus pertaining with the Journal. Nevertheless, in the present form it is not suitable for publication on the Journal and requires several amendments as suggested by the following Major points.

Abstract
- There is not a balance between subheadings of the abstract. As an example, the background section is overwhelming in comparison with other parts, while the methods and the results need to be better specified.

Introduction
- This section contains too much information and can be easily cut. Some parts, i.e. those concerning various celebrities, can be post-poned in the discussion section.
- The aims of the study is presented in a not clear way. Please present them in a more formal way (i.e.: “The aims of the present study were as follows: ………………”)

Methods
- In the search strategy, the authors need to specify what kind of database is Newsbank, giving also a useful reference
- While the authors give details on Data analysis, no statistical analysis paragraph is given. The authors need to report the way they performed statistical test (chi-square test) and the level of statistical significance.

Results
- Table 2 presentation is misleading. It would be preferable to report column percentages for serious, middle tabloid and tabloid newspaper, instead of raw percentages.
- Moreover, significant differences were reported in table 2, but they were not cited in the main text. Please provide.
- At page 12, in the subheading "Information about HPV infection and vaccination", the statement that starts with “This is in stark contrast to articles………” can be moved more properly to discussion
- Some p values in table 2 are reported as “0.0000”. Please replace with “< 0.0001”

Discussion
- The authors did not indicate the limitations of the study, in terms of validity and ways in controlling for bias. Please provide

References
- The references are not reported as suggested in the norms for authors.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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