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Reviewer's report:

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

The authors have made a considerable effort to improve the manuscript and address the comments and issues the reviewers have risen. However, some points are still not completely addressed and should be still revised:

Introduction:

• Globocan 2012 presents indeed specific information on breast cancer in RDC. Look at country fact sheets by population

• The last sentence of the introduction section (the one referring to the BRCA mutation) is already a result, therefore should be better placed in the results section

Methods:

• The new first paragraph of the methods section (just before the ethics one) belongs to the introduction since is background and should be better placed there

• The flow diagram is a good idea to illustrate the strategy process, but then it should be exhaustive and all the numbers must be fulfilled in each box (e.g. how many people and their profession in the expert group, in the awareness group, how many palpable masses, how many no palpable lesions, how many women without any sign, how many without no info on follow-up) notably from the 4315 women reached to the 167 women referred to the hospital

• The sentence “Participants belonged to a wide range of ages” could be better formulated as the range of ages which were included in the study

• Still some sentences are already part of the results section and should be rather placed there, such as “one family with breast cancer at young ages was identified” and “Because this is the first attempt to organize a cancer registry, no decisive conclusion on the incidence of breast cancer could be drawn in this study”. For the latest, if the authors want to keep it in the methods section the sentence should be reformulated

Results:

• Table 2 is very important new item to present the results. However, it should be specified in the title that it refers only to the women referred to the hospital (n=167) otherwise is confusing
Figures' legend:
• The figure’s legend is incorrect (e.g. figure 4 is mammograms per year and not figure 3 as it is indicated in the figure’s legend list)

References:
• Since GLOBOCAN 2012 is reference 1 there is no need to use GLOBOCAN 2008 as reference 2 since the last is outdated
• Since the usefulness of BSE in reducing breast cancer mortality is controversial topic maybe some reference on the pertinence of using BSE in LMIC could be added

General:
Still some editing in English is required at a number of places

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests