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Reviewer's report:

Main points:
1. As the majority of cases were in situ, what kind of these lesions you were talking about? Only high grade intraepithelial neoplasia? Only CIN3? Is there any chance of having included also intraepithelial low grade lesions? If so, low grade intraepithelial lesions might be excluded, or analyzed separately, or this information might enter the limitations of the study.

2. The discussion could be improved in some points. This is an important study but the discussion is very timid. According your results, as the national program of prevention of cervical and breast cancer had a probable impact on the increase of in situ lesions and the reduction of mortality, it deserves a better description. Briefly you could describe the program actions and suggestions for its improvement.

3. The limitation of the study describe in page 8 is not clear. Are you trying to say that possible duplicities occurred among the included cases? If so, how this could affect your results?

4. In page 7, based on European studies, you concluded that “organized screening is not necessary to reduce the incidence...”. If you do this observation, you must to discuss the influence of education of the population and the health system. Otherwise, your affirmation seems dangerous.

5. The conclusions are not exactly your conclusions and must be re-written. Your aims were to identify tendencies of incidence and mortality. Besides, you observed an important influence of government and women consciousness, and you’ve showed others studies pointing the importance of screening programs. The inclusion of a possible role of HPV vaccine in your conclusions, in the context of your study, is inadmissible.

Minor points:
1. Please describe exactly how many cases of in situ entered the study. The presentation as “The majority of the identified cases were in situ” is too vague.

2. The presentation of mean and standard deviation (SD) could be just as mean±SD but not as you’ve done (for example, page 4, “The average age of women with in situ neoplasias was 40 with a Standard Deviation (SD) of ±13 years”).

3. Another formal consideration is the information of percentage without the number of cases. For example, page 4, “Distribution by age groups for in situ
showed that 32% occurred between….”. The data would be better described if number and percentage (not just the percentage) were written.
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