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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper investigating predictors of awareness of existence of cervical and breast screening, reporting having had cervical screening and reporting breast self-examination.

My main criticism relates to the model underlying the analyses. It is not clear what the hypotheses are; there are too many predictors examined. I struggle to work out, for example, why blood pressure or BMI might influence awareness of cancer screening. I suggest that the authors reexamine the analysis including only those predictor variables that they think have a direct causal link to cancer screening awareness, uptake or BSE.

Aside from this there may be an issue statistically with multiple testing.

I am not clear why prevalence rate ratios AND odds ratios are presented. They each have their limitations. Stick with one and discuss the limitations.

The results of the multiple regression analyses should be included in the main paper, not supplementary information because they are critical to understanding the issue. But in any case these should only include a more limited set of variables.

The English needs revision, especially the prepositions and the articles, but there are a large number of other errors that make it difficult to be clear what the authors mean.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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