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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions

• The objectives of the study are not well stated

• It would be enlightening to inform how some questions were raised during the FGD. Readers can be suspicious about the information gathered regarding the importance of cervical cancer during health talks. Depending on how the question was done, the internal validity can be affected. It might exist a ceiling effect regarding this aspect.

• It needs to be clarify in the Methods section how participants get to give opinions about screening methods and on positive results, when previously the have said that they didn’t know about cervical screening. Where they informed about this aspects in order to assess their opinions on how to deal with positive results?. This is not consistent.

• On the discussion section it is said that “Information gathered from the nurses on interview also revealed that …”. It was not stated on the methods section that nurses were also included on the research. Please provide further information on this aspect.

• It is not clear which are the 11 and then 4 broad areas announced on the Material and Methods sections.

• The theoretical framework is correct, but it is not well connected and related with the findings

Discretionary revisions

• It would contribute to the understanding to provide more information on the ANC process. eg: participants comments suggests that HIV screening frequency is very high. Are other screenings being done?

• In the Results section it is not necessary to present the frequency of the socio demographic variables since they are already being present in the table

• Provide information of percentage of women who have previous pregnancies in the socio demographic description. This can affect the amount of information on cervical cancer.

• In the Discussion Section, the first paragraph repeats the socio demographic results, this is redundant.
In the Discussion Section it is stated that the study provided “qualitative information on the perception of the utilization of cervical cancer screening among women”. It would be more accurate to state that it provides information about knowledge, attitudes and perceptions (KAP) on cervical cancer and its screening methods.

• Revise expressions as “The study has revealed that the women did not hear much about cervical cancer in the clinics.” It would be more correct to state “women might not hear enough…”. Use a potential language either than affirmative when presenting theories coming from qualitative data.

• Verbatims can be shorter and analysis could be more extensive

• Spellling mistakes

  o Page 7
  # “The table also provides a summary of the common the reasons for poor utilization of cervical cancer”
  # “Table 4 provides summary of the. Most of….”
  o Page 8
  # “The study has revealed that that the…”
  o Page 9
  # “using the services as they did not know about the services or here to obtain such services”
  # “A Swedish Study reported then non attendance to cervical screening was positively associated with time-consuming and economic barriers”
  o Page 10
  # “Women have still reechoed the need to…”
  # “fact cannot b over emphasized…”
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