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Reviewer's report:

General
This is an interesting, and timely, report of the quality of information available on the Internet related to cancer, in this case specifically cervix cancer.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The investigators have not provided sufficient detail as regards what was considered to be sufficient to define quality or reliability. Were the specific statements within the site reviewed to determine if the recommendations were accurate and complete, or was the simple recording of recommendations that appeared to follow-up a rational approach sufficient for this statement?
How did the lay individual assess the quality of medical treatments recommended?
Is it sufficient to have a single lay individual review the material to state the experience of the "public"? Was this individual particularly knowledgeable about the topic?
If references were provided, was the appropriateness of the citations considered in the evaluation of the validity of the content?
Why was it assumed information on "staging" was imperative? Do the investigators feel patients know their precise stage, especially in the setting of the complexity of staging of cervix cancer? Why would a general statement regarding the management of "local", "regional" or "metastatic" disease not have been sufficient in this area?
How was appropriate follow-up defined?
What is the "treatment of recurrent" disease that should have been included in Internet sites?

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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