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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24094062 - this paper should be cited and used as a comparison for the work detailed. By omitting this, you omit very important work which is comparable to the present study. A number of statements will require amendment since they are clearly inaccurate. The uptake for all 3 doses in Scotland is higher (<90%) than detailed herein and was published prior to this manuscript - however, it could be revised to state that it's the first study to look at school-based vaccine compliance with respect to Gardasil.

I think a more comprehensive literature review is required as important papers are missing.

Minor Essential Revisions

Please include the following papers in your introduction:


Methods - what is meant by 'generally requires parental consent' - as this is policy, surely girls cannot be vaccinated unless there is parental or guardian consent. Please clarify.

Please clarify whether $450 CAD is for one dose or 3 doses of vaccine.

Please check spelling of diphtheria on page 6.

Discussion - presume 'series' and not 'serious'.

Please revise the discussion with respect to the Potts study mentioned above.

How is adverse event monitoring maintained in Ontario for children who receive >3 doses of vaccine?

The H1N1 pandemic did not affect HPV vaccine uptake in Scotland - compare with your own data and explore why there may be differences.
Why in America where vaccine uptake is lower are they seeing positive benefits e.g. Kahn et al., 2012, Pediatrics, 130, p. 249? Discuss in context of your statement that lower uptake in Canada than expected may not see as much of an impact as expected.

Figures 2 and 3 - please use hatched bars vs solid bars since it is hard to compare the different variables.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

No competing interests. Employed within NHS in Scotland.