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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study of the relationship between hormonal contraceptives and cervical cancer in a novel population. More details about the study design are needed though and the analyses need to be repeated with consistent adjustment for number of sexual partners before it should be published.

Methods â## More details about the population from which the controls were recruited are needed. Who were the women attending this clinic and how might they have differed from the women attending the colposcopy clinic from which the cases were recruited? For example did they come from the same geographic area?

Methods - What were the response rates from the cases and the controls? Was there any attempt to frequency match on age? If not then it is very surprising how close in age the two groups were. What were the inclusion criteria for both the cases and controls?

Table 1 â## are these values means and standard deviations?

Table 2 â## what is the comparison group for severity of disease? Is it a case-case analysis? Please provide more details and justification - what is the interpretation?

Table 2 â## In the absence of information on HPV all multivariate models should include adjustment for number of sexual partners. HPV is such a strong potential confounding factor that it is difficult to believe that number of sexual partners did not confound the relationship between HC use and disease. It is not clear why different models included different variables. What was the basis for variable selection? Were categories of sexual partners used for adjustment of the disease severity model or was it used as a continuous variable?

Table 2 - What was the comparison group for length of exposure? 0 years or <= 4years use?

Page 8 discussion - IARC has formally classified hormonal contraceptives as a cause of cervical cancer, so it too strong to say that there is no consensus about this relationship (see Cogliano V, Grosse Y, Baan R, Straif K, Secretan B, El Ghissassi F. Carcinogenicity of combined oestrogen-progestagen contraceptives and menopausal treatment. Lancet Oncology 2005; 6:552-553.)
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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