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Reviewer’s report:

This study aims to assess the additional benefit of introducing HPV testing in addition to cytology for the detection of CIN2 or worse among under-screened women in Spain. The main outcome is the longitudinal prediction of CIN2 or worse. I found the manuscript well written, easy to read and interesting. Although I am not a statistical reviewer, the statistics appear appropriate for the analysis and well described.

Major Compulsory Revisions - I have none

Discretionary Revisions –

1. I suggest that the authors rewrite the discussion to follow strobe, it will aid the reader through their arguments to support their results.

- Discretionary Revisions

2. The authors state that 7% of women underwent colposcopy and biopsies for unknown reasons. Is it possible that these women have been regularly screened through the private sector? I don't think this is a mayor issue but perhaps should be mentioned in the discussion.

3. Is the HPV positivity rate among women with cytology negative high (14.5%)? In fact can the authors comment on the HPV positivity found in the study compared to the general population?

4. The small number of women who were cytology positive, HPV negative and the fact that there was no disease among them suggested that the quality of cytology in Spain is poor. This may also be the reason why no additional gains were observed with co-testing.

Minor Essential Revisions - "Minor issues not for publication"

First paragraph of the introduction: “This it is well accepted that the success of any screening programme will markedly rely if it reaches a high coverage”. I wasn’t quite sure what they meant – do they mean that successful screening programmes rely on high coverage to achieve success?

Results second to last paragraph: “Among the HPV positive one, 15 women had a persistent....” I would remove the word ‘one’.
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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