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Reviewer’s report:

This is very interesting topic, however, it need major compulsory revisions.

1# The title doesn’t cover the whole research contents: it just talk about comparison of three genotyping methods for HPV, but actually in full text, we also find the comparison for CIN detection.

2# In Statistical part, it is unclear about the criteria of detecting genotype in CLART method?

3# About relative prevalence, I don’t agree with the author. From Table, it is ratio of CLART vs LA.

4# In the comparison of agreement between CLART and LA, it will be better to understand the consistence and difference in Table 2 as the following forma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLART</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>.......</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5# The similar revised should be done in Table 3.

6# Some important comparisons in Table 1 should be analyzed using statistical methods and tell the reader whether there are differences among different variables (age, cytology..) or not.

7# What are significances of data from both Table 4 and Table 5?

8# In line 239-242, how the author analyses the se of CLART, LA and HC2?

9# Why in your study, you use Surepath samples? Do you have any test results in general population?
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