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Reviewer's report:

Wang et al reported nationwide HPV prevalence and genotype distribution in cervical specimens in Chinese women in a large-scale cross-section study. Prevalence and genotype distribution were different in ages and cities. Although most of the study results were descriptive, the study provided, I think, the largest scale covering 37 different geographic regions of China. This authoritative information is critical for future HPV public health policy and vaccine development in China.

1. The manuscript was casually written with lots of typos. For some reason, the authors were not used to using spaces in the manuscript: on page 14 only, spaces were missing from line 332 (before [33]), line 333 (before [21]), line 224 (after CAP), line 344 (after &) and line 346 (before and after &). The revision should be proofread by a scientist whose native language is English before resubmission.

2. Title: Add “and genotype distribution” between “prevalence” and “of”. The authors should include main region distribution results in the “Results” paragraph as it was indicated in the “Conclusions” paragraph (line 52).


5. Lines 221-222: Please define and clarify the “low burden regions”. Should this be included in Materials and Methods section (Statistical analysis)?

6. Results section: contents can be shortened especially for those presented in tables and figures.

7. Lines 285-303: The authors uncovered the varied HPV prevalence distribution among different cities. I think the authors should provide some potential reasons to explain these differences.

8. Lines 323: It is good to provide some assumptions. This part needs to be extended with supporting references cited.

9. Lines 331-332: This statement is no longer true. Quite a few of HPV devices have been cleared by DFA including the Roche cobas 4800 which also provides limited genotyping information.
10. Lines 334-336: CAP does not provide standards or guidelines. Please check with other institutions such as CLSI, AMP etc. One thing the authors can do to confirm the validity of the Tellgenplex assay is to compare HPV genotype data in published studies done in China by using different genotyping devices.

11. Line 339: Together with reference #34, please also add “Jing L et al, 2014; BMC ID, 14:388”.

12. Line 350: Please delete “Interestingly”. I am not sure this is interesting.

13. End of line 358: The authors need to indicate the usefulness of their findings in relation to vaccine development in China. Besides 16, the HPV vaccine in China should include genotypes 52 and 58 instead of 18.

14. Lines 389-398: I suggest this paragraph be deleted.

15. Fix author listing of reference 34.

16. Is Figure 3 necessary? Data has been presented in Table 2.

17. Figure 4: For each city/region, I suggest using multiple bars for dual, triple, quad and up multiple infections.

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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