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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript by Tingyan Shi et al. examined the association between associations between two SNPs involved in the LAMB3-miR218 pathway and risk of cervical carcinoma in Chinese women and showed that variant G allele of the rs11134527 in pri-miR-218 was significantly associated with a decreased risk of cervical carcinoma. The manuscript was well written and the statistical methods were suitable. However, only two SNPs were investigated in this study, which may decrease the value of the study to some extent. Furthermore, some other issues need to be addressed.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. It is difficult to understand why a SNP in LAMB3 was selected in this study. The role of LAMB3 in the development of cervical cancer was unclear in the Introduction. Additionally, as described by the authors, there are more than 900 target genes for miR218 except LAMB3.

2. In the introduction, the authors should stress the importance of miRNAs, especially miR-218, in the cervical cancer.

3. Only the association between rs11134527 and risk of cervical carcinoma was significant, but not for rs2566. Thus, it is not necessary to do the analysis for the combined effect of these two SNPs.

4. Page 9, “…homogeneity tests suggested that there was no difference in risk estimates between the strata, and no statistical evidence for interactions between the genotypes and these variables on risk of cervical carcinoma…”. Please provide some statistical values to state this more clearly.

5. Page 11, “…Additionally, for LAMB3 rs2566, in this study, all observed genotype distributions in cases and controls agreed with HWE; however, in the previous study [6], departure from HWE was observed in cases (P=0.0001)…” I don’t think it is necessary to discuss the HWE value in cases, because these patients cannot stand for all subjects.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 9, “…To further explored whether…”. The “explored” should be changed by “explore”.
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