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Reviewer's report:

1. For the measurement tool, the RC-CHBMS, it would be better to describe how the scores were calculated. The 5-point scale should be described if it was 0-4 or 1-5. In addition, is there any cutoff value for the scale? or if it can be reported in categories? The report in categories can be more understandable and meaningful than mean scores. The authors might also want to interpret and discuss the minimal differences in the score, e.g., 0.2 difference, if this is meaningful in clinical practice or applications.

2. Is it possible that some women received screening at other hospital or clinics other than the study hospital? If so, the reported rate of follow up might be underestimated and rate of abnormal screening could vary in either direction. If so, this should be pointed out and added to the discussion.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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