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Reviewer’s report:

The revised manuscript is more explicate.

Additional Minor Revisions:

Background, 2nd sentence: define the abbreviation: (UCC, Uterine Cervix Cancer)

The 2nd sentence of the Discussion is not clear. Did you meant to compare the highest and the lowest proportion of women who contacted their health care provider?

Results, last paragraph: Specify the significance; indicate IRR (CI 95%) and/or p value).

It is difficult to make any comments on Tables and statistics as they are not submitted in visible manner (half is missing in the pdf format).

Discussion/conclusion: the author should emphasise the alternative approach to improve cervical cancer control in Colombia that is the need of introduction of HPV vaccination. Apparently in Columbia, the problem is the coverage of the target population and especially the follow-up of women with cervical abnormalities. A health policy is a major problem and not the type of the screening test although visual inspection with acetic acid, self vaginal sampling, liquid based cytology and HPV DNA detection could improve and facilitate the screening program. HPV vaccination, on the other hand, if offered to the whole target population (adolescent) regardless of the insurance status, since this study clearly demonstrates that it is creating a tremendous health inequality, might contribute, in long run, better cancer control in Columbia.
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