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Reviewer's report:

General
The manuscript is much improved following the revisions made by the authors, however I still believe there are some further changes that are required.

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

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

1. Add a comment in the discussion about the limitations of comparing study findings with data collected from a historical sample as described on page 22.

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

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

1. Add n in addition to %s in the survey results.
2. Page 22 para 2 and table 3: I think you should put the results of the main study survey first and the historical sample second and change the text accordingly, 'Table 3 shows the results of the survey on participants knowledge and compares these findings to those collected in the needs assessment (a historical sample of men surveyed on their knowledge PSA - see ref for further details)'.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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