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**INTRODUCTION**


**MATERIAL AND METHODS**

2) Your study is NOT longitudinal. A longitudinal study implies that subjects in the study are seen more than once to follow-up on their status. YOUR STUDY is a cross-sectional study. Please revise.

3) I am still not sure about what you mean regarding the selection of samples….You stated “….total of 1,137 abnormal specimens from fixed tissue sections of biopsies and LEEPs diagnosed since January 2005 to July 2010 were included, as a consecutively stratified not randomly taken samples” Do you mean that you take all samples from 2005 and 2011. If yes, why don’t you just simplify and state that you selected all samples diagnosis between 2005 and 2011….

4) authors did not answer previous comment about providing 95% confidence intervals for estimates (percentage). I strongly believe that this should be included.

5) The Result section (and other portion of the manuscript ) are still written as an output and not as a manuscript.

The authors did not considered all the previous comments concerning the DISCUSSION (These are repeated below)

The Discussion is well written. However, results should be discussed and compared considering 95% confidence intervals around their estimates. For example, authors concluded that HPV18 was more prevalent in CIN1 (7.2%) than in CIN 2-3 (5.7%). Authors need to be cautious when comparing similar results. CIs probably do not differ (no significant difference).

Important limitations of the study should be discussed:

- Small sample size
- Low external validity (only one site), hard to generalize the results to the entire population of Spain
- Detection of only 20 HPVs genotypes whereas more than 40 mucosal exist. It may underestimate HPV prevalence.
- etc.

Conclusion can be merged with the Discussion. And the last sentence of the conclusion is very strong. Obviously, the effectiveness of the vaccine seems very good in Spain as more than 85% of ICCs are caused by HPV-16/18! I think that one of the most important conclusions here is that the vaccine will be very good in Spain to prevent cervical cancer!

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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