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AIDS knowledge and attitudes in a Turkish population: an epidemiological study
Reviewer: Andrew Furber

Minor Essential Revisions
Most English publications refer to HIV/AIDS rather than AIDS/HIV and this should be corrected throughout the MS.
They were changed throughout the MS.

Under methods, the italicized sentence commencing General knowledge on the city of Eskisehir… should be deleted and replaced by ‘Setting’.
The sentence “General knowledge on the city of Eskisehir where the survey was conducted” was deleted and it was replaced by “Setting”.

In methods and The questionnaire last sentence replace number by ‘proportion’ and delete ‘suggesting high levels of knowledge’.
“Number” was placed by “proportion”, and the phrase “suggesting high levels of knowledge” was deleted.

In results and sample characteristics change 12 to 83 to 11 to 83 (presuming this is correct as stated elsewhere in the text”).
“12 to 83” was placed by “11 to 83”. As the Reviewer indicated it is correct.
AIDS knowledge and attitudes in a Turkish population: an epidemiological study
Reviewer: Omar Khan

Major Compulsory Revisions:
The quality of English is much better and we appreciate the authors taking measures to improve readability. However, some examples remain which need to be corrected for publication. Eg, the use of ‘proposals’ in the Abstract Background; the phrase ‘women/men more disagreed with...’ on page 6; the wording of the Conclusion is a bit awkward.
The paper has been re-edited to the following compulsory revision recommendations:
‘proposals’ has been changed to ‘comments’ in the abstract.
Page 6 ‘women/men more disagreed’ has been changed to ‘women/men disagreed more”
The conclusion has been cut into shorter sentences to better aid comprehension.
Several other small spelling and structural mistakes have also been corrected, for example: ‘mass-media were’ has been changed to ‘mass-media was’ on pg. 7.
The 1st sentence of discussion paragraph 2 has been reworded to aid comprehension.
Pg.8 paragraph 2, final sentence has been changed from ‘This may be explained by women being more sensitive due to the mothering instinct’ to ‘This may be explained by women being more sensitive due to naturally possessing the mothering instinct.’
Pg 9 ‘most media have’ has been corrected to ‘much of the media has’

Discretionary Revisions:
Consider acknowledging the proof reader who has been mentioned as contributing significantly to the paper
Actually, as I mentioned before, as “The English of the paper was re-written by an English teacher, who works in our city, from England in view of grammatical, spelling and general design and also checked by an associate professor from the infectious illnesses department.” that professor only controlled the paper. The professor did not give any contribution to the paper. Thus, I choose to ignore that professor’s name in the section “Acknowledgement”.