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Reviewer's report:

This is a very important topic. We tend to think that it would be enough to offer screening for cervical cancer, but reality teaches that utilization of such services remains poor. One explanation could be poor client satisfaction with existing services. Therefore, the topic of this paper is highly relevant.

However, I have a number of major issues that must be addressed.

- Abstract: you should give some more information, e.g. instead of just writing “independent variables” you should list them in brackets.
- In one sentence you mention the relation between HIV and Cervical cancer. This is not sufficient.
- [1]: is there nothing else in the literature, e.g. from other countries?
- I do not agree that patient satisfaction is an element of the process quality. Patient satisfaction is definitely a dimension of subjective quality and therefore of output.
- you must attach the questionnaire / instrument.
- You do not question why people are so satisfied. Could this be simply a cultural issue? To my experience African women are not likely to complain – in particular for a service that is free of charge. And you do not explain the great difference between high client satisfaction and poor demand for services. My impression is that something is wrong here. Either your instrument does not measure properly or what you call satisfaction is irrelevant for the demand.
- VIA: I thought it does not make sense for women after menopause? You have women up to 70 years?
- what kind of treatment for pre- and invasive cancer stages do you offer? Who pays for it?
- Hospital: 72.5 % of women: that might be a great bias!
- Waiting times 46 % > 5 hours and still highly satisfied? That is completely contrary to the entire literature.
- If I understand it right, the entire econometric model is about “very satisfied” or “satisfied”. The difference is rather fuzzy!
- Discussion definitely has to be expanded and literature has to be added here.

In addition, some minor issues could be addressed:
- The paper needs editing, for instance “2007 and 20010”.

- Literature should have a space before, i.e. not “xxx[2]” but “xxx [2]”.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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