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Abstract

Major Compulsory Revisions

• This should be clear to the reader that the findings from the study support findings from other European countries as there were generally low public awareness for risk factors of cancer. – This could be outlined in the conclusion.

• In line 49-50. Although the author used the sentence “may contribute to disparities in cancer incidence and prognosis”, the other factors that contribute to poor cancer prognosis is the delay in diagnosis. Several factors contribute to the delay in diagnosis includes unawareness of public / patients of early signs or symptoms of cancer, GP’s failed to diagnose or refer cancer patients at an early stages of the disease and also, there might be a delay in starting treatment in secondary care.

Minor Essential Revisions

• Could confidence intervals (CIs) for the significate findings be included?

• Line 50-51. “Efforts should be made to improve awareness”. How that can be implemented? Please give examples. What are the most effective tool that are applicable to do this in Sweden and Denmark?

Background

Minor Essential Revisions

• Line 72-75. Yes, it is knowing, but can the author put the reference/references?

• Line 80-81. Any reasons were found in the study that attributed to such differences?

Material and methods

Major Compulsory Revisions

Population samples were selected at random. How was the sample selected? What type of randomization was used?

Minor Essential Revisions

• Line 110. Would you please brief more, what “Module 2 survey through the
ICBP” means for the international readers?

• Line 119-120. I think the author means see the detail in studies references 18 & 19.

• Any reliability test has been conducted? What was the results of Cronbach's alpha in the pilot study, if it has been conducted indeed?

• Why “don’t know” added to “disagrees” and “strongly disagree”?

• Line 172-174. In Sweden, the average age of respondents was slightly higher and had high education than in Denmark. Does this contribute to the factors for the differences?

Discussion

Major Compulsory Revisions

• The questionnaire introduced through telephone interviews and not as “self-administrative” Any bias is expected while using such method?

• Did people who conducted telephone interviews had any training to avoid any misleading while asking the questions? If not, then this should be one of the study’s limitation.

Conclusions

Minor Essential Revisions

Again, how public awareness for cancer risk factors can be improved? Please explain strategies that are relevant to both countries. Give examples of their effectiveness using evidences.

Can the same methods be applicable to the third World/ developing countries?
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