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Reviewer's report:

1. This is an important study that is overall well written, interesting and adds important new knowledge. It does however show that the author’s first language is not English. I strongly recommend that the paper should be copy edited for English expression by an editor with expertise in academic editing.

2. Methods section overall: This section seems lengthy and to read somewhat like a thesis chapter rather than a paper. Think about revising the section

3. Page 5, Gardasil and Cervatrix are introduced. Later in the paper there are many references to the recent nature of the vaccines, it should be noted on page 5 when the vaccine was released and when it was made available in Hong Kong.

4. Page 10: you raise a question about the period of efficacy for the HPV vaccine, perhaps think about raising this issue in the introduction as well.

5. Methods (page 6) the author first says that individual semi structured interviews were conducted. She than says that interviews were conducted one-on-one which is redundant therefore not needed.

6. Page 7: unclear sentence: "to protect participants' privacy and confidentiality no identifiers of participants were mentioned throughout the interviews". Please clarify.

7. Page 8: unclear sentence: "Quick data analysis was conducted during interviews to ensure what was known and what needed to be explored further" I am unfamiliar with analysis during an interview. Please clarify.

8. Page 9: "emic understanding" is a specific anthropological term, think about using plain language.

9. Page 9: you detail the employment status of the women, what about their education status? Was this collected? Did it make any difference to participant attitudes?

10. Page 19: you raise the matter of cultural values in relation to sexual début and transmission of HPV, however there is no mention in the paper of men's role in transmission. This might be a good place to mention this, and lack of focus among participants in this as a risk. Even if a woman has only one partner, her male partner may have other sexual partners.

11. Page 20: the author discusses the role of primary care doctors as prevention education. In the data (see quote from P25) the participants do not appear to understand doctors as having this role. There may be a disconnect between
earlier biomedical discourses about doctors as healers, and more recent ones about doctors as promoting health and well being that is worth drawing attention to.

12. Page 22: Limitations - Think about adding that a future study about knowledge and understanding about HPV, vaccines and health promoting behaviours with primary care providers is needed.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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