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Reviewer's report:

"PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Authors have addressed the comments of reviewer 2. I still think there are some few different issues that should be addressed.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
I have reviewed the manuscript "Burden and Genotype distribution of High Risk Human Papillomavirus infection and Cervical Cytology Abnormalities at Selected Obstetrics and Gynecology Clinics of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia".

Methods.
Please describe who or how many cytologists and his/her degree of expertise did the cytological diagnosis.

Results.
Lines 141-145 and Figure 2.
The statement that the age range 31-60 was found to have the highest proportion of positivity. Is this association statistically significant or solely reflect the fact that this age group has more patients? Please clarify this. Figure 2, I do think is not necessary, and from the opinion of this reviewer, it can be deleted.

Please define in table 2 and 3, "COR" and "AOR". Also, clarify the meaning of refa (a) in superscript)
Abnormal cervical Cytology and Table 4. Please state whether these differences were statistically significant. Also, indicate this in the table.

Please detail in a table or in the text, how the Kappa value was determined. Is unclear for this reviewer.

The discussion and conclusions are somehow redundant or repetitive and merely descriptive, authors should try to condense these two sections and do not only limit to compare their results with other studies, but try to hypothesize the clinical or epidemiological meaning of their findings.

Figure 1 and 3 should also include in the pie chart the "negative" percentage and percentage of "normal cytology cases" respectively.

The discussion should also include some comments on the proportion of cytologically normal cases who were HR HPV positive in this study as compared to the literature. These are a couple of references.


ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

None"

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

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

No

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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