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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is well written, with clear objectives and outcomes. The missing link: What can we use this paper for in a public health context. I still do not know if the screening was meaningful in a clinical way. Did you discover any pathology, did you refer any patient to second level, what was the incidence of discovered findings? Please add some quantitative background. If not, I will know that the ladies are happy, but nothing about the prevalence and the clinical challenge in the population.

If some hard facts are included in the Result sections as real background information it will improve the paper significantly. You should not delete any of the qualitative content, but add information about the rationale for the screening. To my knowledge, cervical cancer is a big and increasing problem in southern Africa, but this paper is not building evidence for that in the state of today.

The next worry: Is this a real screening if only a few % are included? The definition and rationale for a screening are strictly defined, and some words in the introduction should adress this.

There is a need for major revisions, and I would be happy to see the next version as soon as possible.

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.
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