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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for having to read this interesting manuscript.

There are some comments and questions I want to reach.

Abstract
I would like to see here also when the data were collected.

Introduction
I would like to see more updated statistics here, newer information exists.

When you write like many studies (add here references).

You may add text what previous literature tells to us about knowledge, attitudes and practice. You are investigated these. Now you have written just limited information of these which you are also studying.

You are now writing which campuses participated in this study, please delete this kind of information through the text, we should be careful in ethical issues. Try also to write more advanced reason for this study, not just that the topic has not been investigated in this certain area. We have lot of areas and we cannot investigate everywhere.

Methods
Delete here the names of the campus and university. The sampling is not clear here. So, start with the total 2900 and what happened after that. You are writing about the list of voluntary students. So did you first create a list of voluntary students? Which kind of sampling it was? It seems you had participants from all the departments, was that amount dependent on the total student amount in the department or did you ask same amount from all departments or how.

The structure of the instrument is not presented. So, how was the structure? Was it: knowledge, attitudes and what? In the title of this article you write about knowledge, attitudes and practice. But here you have concepts like awareness and service utilization. The structure of the instrument should be presented. Which kind that was and how many questions and items and how asked? Validity and reliability aspects should also be discussed.
Results
This part is not possible to comment before the structure of the instrument is presented. Now here is a new concept: general knowledge. So, the structure of the questionnaire should be presented. Also the structure of the results would be helped whether you write clear research questions also in this article and then you can create the subtitles of the results section based on the research questions. You have now several subtitles including knowledge. How this first knowledge-title is related to the research questions and the structure of the questionnaire? I am sure this results section is easier to structure after you present clearly research questions and the structure of the used instrument.

Discussion
Here you have again a new conceptual thinking “overall awareness”. So, have you measured knowledge or awareness?

Conclusion
This should be rewritten. The four first lines are appropriate, but after that there is repetition of the results, more advanced conclusion is possible to be created.

References
Some references need to be updated.

Tables
From table 1, please delete the name of the campus and the university
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