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Reviewer's report:

Atuhairwe and colleagues in this cross sectional survey sought to investigate the relationship between knowledge of breast cancer and uptake of prevention practices among women in Kyadondo county, Uganda. They suggest that knowledge levels are low and identify a number of factors associated with prevention practices. While not novel, this is an interesting topic owing to the public health relevance of breast cancer. The study suffers from a number of methodological flaws that need to be mentioned.

General
The title might be modified slightly by changing 'adoption' to 'uptake'

Abstract
In the background, it is not clear what link authors make with HIV epidemic and breast cancer. Consider rephrasing or delete statement.

Methods need to be reworded especially around the statistics

Results can benefit from better structuring.

Major issues
1. Background
   The literature review for the background seems thin and the paper might benefit from more appraisal of literature (in a coherent manner) to set the scene for the gaps addressed in their study.

2. Methods
a) Sampling;
- Can authors clarify their choice of Kyadondo county? Further clarification should be provided on what basis were 10 villages selected out of the 10-20 villages in each cluster. This also applies to selection of households, please clarify your selection/inclusion process.
- Was probability proportional to size method contemplated?

Authors should clearly highlight how selection bias was minimized and consider discussing in the limitations section.

b) Questionnaire and data collection;
- There is no information provided regarding the data collection tool used and variables (with their definitions where appropriate) collected
- Was this an interviewer-administered or self-administered tool? Please mention and discuss the potential limitation of using the former (interviewer bias) and for the latter, comment on the educational level of participants and their ability to comprehend. Highlight those limitations where necessary in the discussion
- How was the tool developed? Was it a previously validated tool? If not, how was validity ascertained?
- On what population was pre-testing done and were these included in the final study sample?
- What do you refer to as breast cancer prevention modalities? These need to be clearly defined in the methods section for better understanding of the results presented.
- How was breast cancer knowledge assessed, quantified and or categorized? This needs to be clearly defined as well.

c) Statistics;
- Nothing is said about the statistical analysis used in the methods section of the paper. The abstract and result section purport that regression analysis were done. It is not clear what are the dependent and independent variables, the rationale for inclusion of variables in the supposed multivariate model and considerations to control for confounding.
3. Results
- What was the response rate in this survey? How many women were approached and how many consented and were included in the study?
- Overall, the results are poorly presented and too lengthy (wordy). Lots of irrelevant information highlighted. The result section should be more focused and in line with your study objective.
- It may benefit from structuring with following proposed sub-headings; e.g. General characteristics of study population, Breast cancer knowledge of study participants, Association between knowledge and uptake of prevention practices, etc.
- Table 2 should indicate the reference categories for better appreciation, and it seems better to present 2 decimal places for the O.R.s and their confidence intervals. Currently seems a bit cumbersome.

4. Discussion
- This should ideally begin by highlighting the key findings of the study before comparing and contrasting with other literature.
- Authors should consider explicitly discussing the limitations of their study.

5. Conclusion
In its current form, the conclusion seems very thin and doesn't clearly summarize the key take-home message from the study.

6. Overall: There are a number of spelling and sentence structure errors which make comprehension of the paper onerous. Paper would benefit from further language editing by native English speaker. Consider discussing the study limitations as well.

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:
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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