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Reviewer’s report:

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
The authors have made one more time an effort to improve the manuscript and address the new comments and issues the reviewers have raised. However, the manuscript has still some structural issues and lack of accuracy that need to be addressed.

Abstract:
• In the methods section all the activities undertaken should be described, including the clinical breast examinations, the referrals and diagnosis of encountered lesions and BRCA testing, at least in a general way.

Introduction:
• Globocan 2012 are estimations, this is important to be specified
• In the last sentence of the first paragraph, where this increase (from 19 to 25.5) has been observed must be indicated
• In the first paragraph the sentences indicating the Age Standardised Rates are not well described, please check (i.e. ASR should not appear after the numbers)
• RDC must be spelled the first time that it appears in the text, like in the abstract
• Some sentences are redundant and sometimes inconsistent between them, for instance in the fourth paragraph the authors mention that “the recording of the occurrence of breast cancer is important to obtain a correct view on the prevalence of these cancers” and later “in the absence of cancer registration, the incidence of cancer is not known”, please check
• Also the two last paragraphs of the introduction contain some redundancies and should be merged in one and presented as the aim of the study. In the resulting paragraph is important to mention the country, DRC. Further details must be provided in the methods sections and not here.
• There are several structural mistakes, for instance references should be properly indicated with a number (Vancouver style) which refers the reader to the reference section and not displayed in the text (e.g. (http://www.who.int/cancer/nccp/en/), http://portal.bhgi.org/pages/default)

Methods:
• In the methods section the expert group is described as having 3 persons but in the flow diagram there are four
The sentence “The BHGI and the WHO both described the need for the study of local cancer population, described by Bridges et al as “developing evidence. [15]” does not belong to the methods section and it should be omitted.

Results:
- The flow diagram has consistently improved, but still needs to be reviewed: The boxes corresponding to the different channels to present the campaign (TV, radio, women organizations, churches and attendees inform neighbors, family members) should be all placed at the sides of the narrow going from the box of the awareness group to the number of women reached, in order to differentiate them from the boxes corresponding to the participants of the studies, and in a way showing that they are at the same level. From the box “Total women reached” (n=4315) should arise another box “Total women examined” and then the sum of the number of palpable lesions + no palpable lesions should correspond to them. The box corresponding to “mammograms in the hospital” since is a activity in parallel should not come from the box of the 4315 women reached.
- The authors indicate that one out of 100 malignant lesions was excluded but just after they state that 87 were invasive and 13 in situ, which sums 100. Please correct.

Discussion:
- I am not sure that the difference between the detection rates of breast cancer in Sudan and RDC can be only attributed to better training in RDC, the sentence should be reformulated as not as clear, other reasons are possible and must be listed.
- The purpose of Mena’s paper is not indicated thus the paragraph comparing the results with it is confusing.
- The comparison highlighted in yellow is not clear and should be reformulated.

Figures:
- The y axis of figure 5 is misleading, are the bars numbers or percentages? Please clarify it by adding a proper label and the number and/or the percentages over the bars.

References:
- Globocan 2012 is not properly referenced, please check.
- Some references contain mistakes, please check.

General:
- English and general editing is highly required.

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.
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