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Reviewer's report:

The paper is very relevant and well prepared.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

Major Compulsory Revisions

Materials:
I think this manuscript would benefit from a large table that included all items used instead of references to old work/work of colleges i.e. expansion of table 1 or as supplement.
Knowledge paragraph: e.g. here a reference is given to previous work for 11 item scale. Instead give scale.

All tables give N

Minor Essential Revisions
Methods
- first paragraph: Give full name for IRB.
Second paragraph: give full name for HIPAA

Results
Table 2: In addition to mean (SD) give distribution of age in intervals e.g. 20-29, 30-39 etc. like ‘years since patient’s diagnosis’.

Discretionary Revisions
Discussion:
The authors could consider the ongoing discussion of whether sunscreen is a sun tanning aid or sun protection and how this influences the results.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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