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Reviewer's report:

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

1. The end of the first paragraph of the background is a little difficult to read with the various numbers and punctuation used. This could probably be streamlined for clarity. Also, are the cancer deaths expected or actual (given the year of report is 2009)?

2. In the discussion, in the last paragraph (at the stop of page 18), the authors indicate that looking to “grey literature” might be useful for this subject matter. Do they have any evidence that this is true?

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

3. On page 15, the sentence reading “It is likely that articles included in this review represent those events that were documented and evaluated than most” seems to be missing a word or two. This sentence should be edited for clarity.

4. On page 16, the word changed should be replaced with change in the sentence reading “In this review, only one event reported a changed in screening of 18%....”

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

5. NONE
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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