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Review report of manuscript titled:

Awareness, Perception and Utilization of Cervical Cancer Screening Services among Women in Ibadan, Nigeria: A Qualitative Study

General comments

1. The research questions were well defined.
2. Some questions have been pointed out below on the methods.
3. Presentation of data is wanting as pointed out below.
4. Discussion leaves out some relevant issues like limitations of the study e.g. selection of participants in antenatal clinic.
5. Comment on title is included below.

Major compulsory revisions/ Issues to address

1. The title should include factors affecting utilization instead of utilization because this was what was researched
2. References: Some cited out of context e.g. Reference 3 and statement that cervical cancer contributes to mortality among women in developing countries (Introduction line 3). Rosenstock(1966) – Theoretical framework, line 1, is not in reference list
3. Methods: Should justify choice of FGDs for the data collection.
4. Methods: Should outline the contents of the FGD guide in particular the themes that informed the discussions- this may be appended at the end
5. Methods: Why use participants attending antenatal clinic? Cervical cancer screening is not performed during pregnancy. It is not surprising that the health messages given did not have information on cervical cancer. They focused on pregnancy and childbirth as expected. Non pregnant women probably in family planning, postnatal or early childhood clinics would have been better participants since it is in such clinics that opportunistic screening is done.
6. Results: It is not common to present results of qualitative studies in tabular form unless one intends to analyze the data quantitatively which is not the case in this study. I find table 2 unnecessary. All that can be summed up as; The health talk dwelt mainly on pregnancy related issues and had no message on
cervical cancer or its prevention. Similarly except for table 1 the information in the other tables can be presented in sentences.

7. Discussion: Quote: The study has revealed that the women did not hear much about cervical cancer in the clinics – Discussion, 2nd paragraph. We need to reflect on the fact that these were women in antenatal clinics where health talk is on pregnancy related issues. What if this study was among women in family planning or postnatal clinics where opportunistic screening is done? Probably the findings would be different.

8. The authors were vague about the status of screening activity in Ibadan. Quote: Screening is being carried out in Nigeria using opportunist method for those who visit certain clinics. – Introduction 2nd paragraph. More information is needed about these clinics and their availability. They are unlikely to be antenatal clinics anyway since screening is not done in pregnancy. The key word here is opportunistic. Their discussion about utilization should take this into account.
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