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Reviewer's report:

General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-- A questionnaire was conducted amongst 310 medical workers (including at least 3 groups), measuring knowledge, attitudes on cervical cancer screening. The response rate was high (92%), but the knowledge about screening was poor, as was the training in this field.

Specific comments include the following:

1. Page 4, line 11: should be 10 years or more.
2. Page 5, 2nd paragraph, line 2: what was the method of selecting the 10%?
3. Page 5, 3rd paragraph, line 2: multiparity is questionable in this regard, as well as low socio-economic status.
4. Page 7, line 1: ... though the speculum.
5. Page 7, last paragraph, line 3: delete (... and have a hospital stay ... at least 6 weeks).
6. Page 7, last paragraph, line 4: start with a new paragraph with “Despite being the commonest cancer ...
7. Page 7, last paragraph, line 7: visual inspection was tested (Cronjé et al, IJGO 2001; Cronjé et al, Am JOG 2003).
8. Page 7, line 9 from bottom: start new paragraph at “In the absence of ...”
9. Page 7, last 3 lines and first 2 lines on page 8: shorten by just saying it is possible to train nurses.
10. Page 8, line 5: should read ... “in departments other than Gynaecology”.
11. Page 8, line 9: “who” (respondents who had never been screened).
13. Page 8, last paragraph: delete.

This manuscript should be shortened and changed where indicated. It is, however, of sufficient interest to recommend publication.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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