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Reviewer's report:

Re: Cervical cancer screening using direct visual inspection: Default from follow up care and its predictors in Southwestern Nigerian.

It is an important public health issue. Any attempt to improve the screening services would positively improve life expectancy of women. Identifying the predictors of non-adherence to national and or local programme is thus of paramount importance.

The manuscript is well written. However, the following shortfalls should be dealt with before acceptance.

The title can be changed to make it more catchy/ attractive to readers.

Text
The first sentence of introduction is incomplete.

Method
What were the HIV and anti-retroviral treatment status of the sample? Was there any effect on non-adherence to cervical cancer screening? One might argue the relationship thus it would be appreciated to indicate.

The standard DVI or the practice on DVI should be explained in the method section for the understanding of the general readers.

It is not understood from the manuscript that the process of data collection from the defaulters. How the pattern of and reasons for default were measured? Was it a questionnaire survey or Focus group discussion?

How did the authors determine the sample size? Was the sample adequate to test the hypothesis?

The type of study (study design) is unknown from the method section.

There is no mention of time when this research was started and finished (data collection and or field work).

What happened to those who had migrated in or out of the area?

One would like to know the standard education (?) was given to women before screening proper. It is also important for readers to know what the national and or local strategy is regarding cervical cancer screening in Nigeria.

Results
Well written results but it is not clear how the pattern and reasons for default were determined. The title of table 2 is incomplete. In “Table 2” the comparison of Crude OR for two groups is not part of the study objective. However, it would probably be better to show the level of significance for the same (difference).

Figure 1 is also confusing. What is DIA. What is the type of study?

Discussion
This part is well written too. The words “in other” after “see and treat strategy” should probably be “in order”.

Conclusions
Most of the conclusions are not derived from the findings of the study namely no’s 1, 2, 4 & 5. Thus there is a need to rewrite the conclusion

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

None