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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you very much for considering my manuscript MS:5332912288003497. I appreciate the useful comments of reviewers to help me improving the article. Below are my responses to the worthy concerns raised by the honorable reviewers:

EDITOR'S COMMENTS:

The paper is improved now that the authors have responded to the reviewers' comments, and in the main these have been carried out satisfactorily. Before a final decision can be reached, I would like to see the authors address one or two additional points. First, reviewer 2 asked the authors to explain what they meant by the term "slightly advanced" cancer, yet in their response, the authors claimed not to be able to find this phrase in the paper. It is indeed there, at the top of page 9, in the sentence "...cancer stage as being from advanced to slightly advanced". The authors should explain what they mean by this term, as reviewer 2 asked.

Response: Changed according to the information given in Table 2 (More than half of the participants (n = 16) reported their cancer stage as being from stage II/III (locally advanced) to stage IV (metastasized to other organs).

Similarly, in their response to reviewer 1, the authors have ended up removing their limitations section. I would like the paper to include a limitations section, so I ask that the authors add this. No study is without limitations. For example, although the authors do not believe that the lack of inclusion of high income groups is a limitation of the study (because this was just the way things turned out), it is something that needs to be raised somewhere in the paper, otherwise the readers will have the same perception of the issue as two of the 3 reviewers, and will believe that high income groups have been deliberately excluded even though this was not the case. Even though it was not a deliberate decision not to target high income individuals, this needs to be explained in the paper. There are a number of other limitations that the authors could include.

Response: issues related to high income group is added in the discussion section, after reference number [35] (Considering socio-economic status as a barrier to cancer screening, it is important to highlight that all of the participants of this study was from low to middle income group which might be a reason to poor response to cancer screening tests)

Limitation section has been added
Reviewer#1
Sarah Flanagan

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

I have only one major compulsory revision - the authors have removed any discussion of the limitations of the study. I feel that consideration should be given to the possible limitations of the study and a section should be added addressing these. 2. Semi-colons should replace the commas between the four major themes identified.

Response: Limitation section has been added and commas are replaced by semi colons.

Regards

Fahad Saleem