MS ID1027493451261217: Identifying the Tuskegee Syphilis Study: Results from the Use of Recall and Recognition Questions in Blacks, Whites and Puerto-Rican Hispanics

This is an interesting manuscript (MS). The MS sought to identify issues associated with distrust in the health care system and its implications on participation in biomedical research in black and minority populations. However, the MS has several content and methodological issues that should be considered before the MS is considered further.

Introduction
In the goal of the study, the authors could be more specific on they consider most or less accessible level of memory retrieval. In addition, the goal seems a little vague as it is clear that the aim of the study is to determine whether there is an association between race/ethnicity and the level of memory retrieval of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study in the study sample.

Methods
Overview
The authors should provide information on the response rate and completion rate. In addition, some information regarding the language used to collect the information in Puerto Ricans (i.e., English only, or English and Spanish). Moreover, the Puerto Rican Hispanic is awkward and should be replaced with Puerto Rican.

The authors should refer to a key word when alluding to questions rather than referring to them as Q27 or Q28. This should apply to table 2 and the description of the results.

The authors should describe the variables to be included in the analysis and at least provide a sense of how the dependent variables were defined for analytical purposes.

The MS lacks a statistical analyses session. The reviewer is wondering whether any qualitative software was used for the coding of key words for the answers of the open ended questions.
Results
If the focus of the paper is whether there are differences in knowledge of the TSS by race/ethnicity, Table 2 should be presented by race/ethnicity. There is no need to repeat the % symbol throughout the table, please delete it.

Figures 1 and 2 should include for the vertical axis and perhaps the authors should consider presenting each response separately rather than in a single bar for each racial/ethnic group.

The title of Figure 2 stated a sample size of 1,1162 rather than 1,162. It is not clear what comparisons the p-values between racial/ethnic groups are referring to in the legends for the figures.

Discussion
The Discussion is light in references and could benefit by comparing the study results to previous studies. The reviewer is wondering whether the authors could present their findings in the context of existing literature in this area or something related to distrust with biomedical research.

The authors should mention the strengths and limitations of the study and their implications on the study results.
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