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Reviewer’s report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors have conducted a cross-sectional study to assess the prevalence of gynecological cancer risk factors and awareness of screening tools in female relatives of cancer patients. A self-administered questionnaire was used for this purpose.

The manuscript could be improved for clarity in data presentation, methods, language and grammar.

It is difficult to tell where all the statistical methods mentioned in the methods section were used (Tukey test, T-test, ANOVA, Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskall-Wallis test, Chi-Square test, Fisher test, Bonferroni correction). I would suggest the authors to mention clearly in the footnotes of the tables where these tests were conducted.

Subgroup analysis has been mentioned in the methods section but no description of the subgroups has been provided in the methods section.

No mention of missing data in the methods section of the limitations in the Discussion.

Recall bias has not been mentioned in limitations of this study.

There is no mention of how patient anonymity was maintained in the Methods section.

In Table 2.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Study methodology section, study limitations section, data presentation, and overall clarity (sentence formation, language, and grammar) can be improved based on above suggestions.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

None.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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