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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

1. The authors describe tiered levels of medical workers in this population. It would be good to know in the introduction what types of medical providers were working with the study sample. An overview of a routine clinical visit would also be an interesting addition (e.g. how long do visits last, what type of medical providers are involved, how far do patients usually travel to get to medical appointments?)

• Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

2. On line 223 the authors assert that “patients with GW has a substantially higher psychosocial burden than the general population.” This is repeated in the conclusions. However, no information re: “psychosocial burden” in the general population is presented. I do not think that the data presented in this paper supports that claim, as the general population is not included in the sample. However, I think that this assertion could be deleted from the paper and it would still represent a unique contribution to the literature.

• Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

3. Beginning on line 325, the authors describe prophylactic HPV vaccination as a suggested mechanism for alleviation of psychosocial burden. This is the first time HPV vaccination is mentioned in the paper, and nothing about the study data is presented in a way that supports this claim. For example, there is no data in the paper about the acceptability of HPV vaccination in this population. While HPV vaccine might serve to alleviate psychosocial burden in the future, I do not believe it is a claim that can be made as an outcome of this particular study. This is even more concerning given that the study was funded by Merck Sharp & Dohme Ltd. I would suggest deleting this paragraph from this manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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