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Reviewer’s report:

Methodology
When more than one site is reported by the interviewers they used the “primary site”
This is unclear once if the patient has a multiple primary tumour (synchronous or Asynchronous) it should be mentioned as first or second tumour because it has an impact increasing patient awareness about cancer.

The manuscript addresses the consistency and accuracy on self reporting cancer diagnosis through a self report interview. It is a valid methodology that can be used to access patients knowledge on cancer diagnosis and validate consistency on cancer. The level of inconsistency were high 30% but it is unclear why it was so high once this population is being followed since 1968 is this is an cohort effect?

The limitations were addressed.the interview is time consuming and it is a dependent factor to reduce accuracy. I wonder how many patients asked to stop the interview due the time or how many has to be rescheduled.

Self reporting studies are instruments with limited value in cancer for the moment perhaps a special strategy should be used to evaluate cancer.

Patients beliefs on cancer diagnosis is not very well understood and this can be a constrain to make public their diagnosis.
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