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Reviewer’s report:

My comments are minor. This is a well thought out and executed research project. The theme is of high importance in the field as participation in cervical cancer screening is an effective measure in reducing mortality and morbidity from this disease. Racial differences have been well documented for a long time and strategies to decrease such differences can potentially have significant impact in screening uptake and down the line, decrease disease burden.

The sample size is small and the study population limited to one site and one stratum of the female population (well educated women, high social status, no barriers to access to care). Nonetheless this should spearhead important research aiming at decreasing disparities in cervical cancer screening rates across racial strata. It is a very promising start!

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Absolutely.

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
  None

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
  I suggest revising the last sentence of second paragraph of the Discussion section to make it clearer – I am not sure I understood it myself because the results of this study, in which there are no significant differences found in the participants vis-à-vis SES and access to care, report differences in screening.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
  None.

**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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